

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1377263

A
WAY TO
PREVENT WAR
ALLAN L. BENSON



Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

FIVE VICTIMS OF CLASS RULE AND SECRET DIPLOMACY

BY W. N. EWER

FIRST SOUL—

I was a peasant of the Polish plain;
I left my plow because the message ran:
Russia, in danger, needed every man
To save her from the Teuton; and was slain.
I gave my life for freedom—this I know:
For those who bade me fight had told me so.

SECOND SOUL—

I was a Tyrolese, a mountaineer;
I gladly left my mountain home to fight
Against the brutal, treacherous Muscovite;
And died in Poland on a Cossack spear.
I gave my life for freedom—this I know:
For those who bade me fight had told me so.

THIRD SOUL—

I worked in Lyons at my weaver's loom,
When suddenly the Prussian despot hurled
His felon blow at France and at the world;
Then I went forth to Belgium and my doom.
I gave my life for freedom—this I know:
For those who bade me fight had told me so.

FOURTH SOUL—

I owned a vineyard by the wooded Main,
Until the Fatherland, begirt by foes
Lusting her downfall, called me, and I rose
Swift to the call—and died in fair Lorraine.
I gave my life for freedom—this I know:
For those who bade me fight had told me so.

FIFTH SOUL—

I worked in a great shipyard by the Clyde,
There came a sudden word of wars declared,
Of Belgium, peaceful, helpless, unprepared,
Asking our aid; I joined the ranks, and died.
I gave my life for freedom—this I know:
For those who bade me fight had told me so.

—The Nation, London.

BOOKS BY ALLAN L. BENSON

THE TRUTH ABOUT SOCIALISM: a plain statement of Socialism that Eugene V. Debs says is "the very clearest and cleverest of all;" 188 pp.; cloth, \$1.00, paper, 25 cents. Eighth edition.

OUR DISHONEST CONSTITUTION: a survey of the men who made our organic law and an explanation of why they made it as it is. "Mr. Benson," says the *Chicago News*, "states the facts so vividly and with so much sarcastically grim humor, that his book is extremely readable;" 182 pp.; cloth, \$1.00, paper, 25 cents.

THE USURPED POWER OF THE COURTS: an analysis of the steps by which the United States Supreme Court claimed the power to declare acts of Congress unconstitutional, though no other court on earth claims such power, the constitution gives our Supreme Court no such power, and the court, for several years, did not claim to have such power; 64 pp.; paper, 5 cents. This pamphlet has had a circulation of more than 200,000 copies and in 1915 was considered at some length in a report made by the New York Bar Association to the convention assembled to draft a new constitution for the State of New York.

APPEAL TO REASON
GIRARD, KAN.

A WAY TO PREVENT WAR

JX
1953
B4

BY

ALLAN L. BENSON

APPEAL TO REASON

GIRARD, KAN.

1915

Copyright, 1915,
By ALLAN L. BENSON



CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
PREFACE	i
I. TO THE WORKING CLASS OF THE WORLD	1
II. AN ANTI-WAR PROGRAM THAT WILL WORK	5
III. IS THE WAR REFERENDUM RIGHT IN PRINCIPLE?	13
IV. IS THERE SUCH A THING AS AGGRESSIVE WAR?	28
V. WARS OF AGGRESSION THAT WERE MADE IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA	45
VI. THE PLACE TO STRIKE THE FIRST BLOW AGAINST WAR	63
VII. WARLIKE PEOPLES AND PEACE-LOVING RULERS	75
VIII. SOCIALISM AND THE WAR-REFERENDUM	89
IX. WOMEN, WAR AND THE BALLOT	105
X. THE CAUSES OF MODERN WAR	119
XI. PATRIOTISM	131
XII. TO CHRISTIANS WHO PRAY FOR PEACE	140
XIII. THE PROSPECTS FOR MORE WAR	148
XIV. WAR AND SOCIALISM	155
APPENDIX	174

334097

PREFACE

If the people were in favor of war, the way to end war would be to convert the people to peace. This book is devoted to the task of showing that since the people are opposed to war the logical way to end it is to take the power to declare war from minorities who misuse it and vest it in the people who may be depended upon not to use it at all. Public sentiment in favor of peace can be of little practical value so long as a minority in each nation control the war-making machinery.

The ideas upon which this book is based began to come to me twelve days after the outbreak of the Great War in Europe, while I was writing an article on the war for *Pearson's Magazine*. It seemed such a colossal wrong that perhaps fifty men should have the power to force war upon 350,000,000 who did not want it. I had written more than half of the article when the idea came to me that only the people, voting by direct ballot, should have the power to declare war—and thus it was that the demand for a referendum on war was first made in an article devoted to the war in Europe.

For the next seven months, I did little else but develop the idea, write about it and speak about it.

One article, when re-printed as a pamphlet, had a circulation of more than 2,000,000 copies. The Executive Committee of the Socialist Party has endorsed the plan in principle and, as noted on Page 102, it has received enthusiastic support elsewhere.

All except the last chapter of this book was printed serially in the *Appeal to Reason*, the Socialist weekly published at Girard, Kansas. The last chapter was first printed in *Pearson's Magazine*.

A. L. B.

Yonkers, N. Y., April, 1915.

A WAY TO PREVENT WAR

CHAPTER I

TO THE WORKING CLASS OF THE WORLD

THE knife is at your throat and the pistol is at your heart.

You must end war or war will end you.

What the great men of the world have failed to do, you must do or you die. What the great men of the world have failed to do you can do, because you are wholly opposed to war and they are not.

It is idle to say that the ruling classes of the world could not end war if they wholly believed in peace. Between sunrise and sunset of any day they could sink their navies and disband their armies. Disarmament is both simple and effective. But no nation disarms because each nation is governed by a small ruling class of capitalists who do not really want perpetual peace.

Every ruling class is opposed to every war in which it sees no opportunity to obtain profit for itself. But every ruling class favors war if it can accomplish its purpose in no other way. The capitalists of Great Britain regretted our war with Spain, but did not regret their own war with the Boer republics. The capitalists of the United States regretted the war between

Russia and Japan, but did not regret our war with Spain and the Philippines.

The time has come when the working class, the world over, must speak or die.

Civilization cannot long endure if it be subjected to many more such assaults as the great war that broke out in Europe in the summer of 1914.

Civilization could and did survive the wars of the past, but the wars of the past were as nothing in comparison with this war.

Grant so shed human blood that, in the dark days of the American Civil War, thousands called him a butcher.

The generation that judged Grant did not know what butchering meant.

Beside the European commanders of to-day, Grant was a mere brawler. Grant, in all his life, never shed so much human blood as these men shed during the first three months of the war. Nor did Napoleon.

All through the ages we have looked to the butchering class to devise means to end butchery. We should no longer look to the butchers—we should look to ourselves.

If civilization is to endure, the working class cannot forever be kept upon the operating table.

The working class must set its face against the farce of a peace tribunal housed in a palace built from the profits on armor plate—a peace tribunal that can prevent all wars except little wars, medium-sized wars and big wars.

The working class must sweep aside these qualified opponents of war and station its own huge bulk in their place.

We do not depend upon burglars to frame our statutes against burglary—why should we depend upon capitalists to bring peace and keep peace?

The only peace these creatures bring to us is the peace of death.

Instead of balm, they give us bombs. After worship, they give us warships. To end war they are willing to do almost anything except to keep the peace. The net result of all their efforts in our behalf is the European war of 1914—the greatest calamity that ever befell the human race.

Yet it would not be accurate to charge that the capitalist peace movement is sheer hypocrisy. It is sincere as far as it goes. It fails only because most of the men behind it want peace with a proviso—peace always if it can be had without detriment to profits; peace always for neighboring nations whose quarrels are without interest to their neighbors; but peace never when the ruling class of a nation believes it can accomplish its purposes in no other way.

A program will now be presented which, if adopted, would bring to the world peace without a proviso—peace without end.

It is not a program that the butchers will approve.

It is not a program based upon a plan that has failed.

It is a program based upon the needs of the working

class—which is equivalent to saying that it will not be installed by the capitalist class. It can be placed in effect only by the working class.

But the working class is strong. It includes all but a fraction of the people. What the working class demands it can have. It has only to learn to demand—and to insist.

Let it demand peace and go about it to bring peace in a way that is its own.

CHAPTER II

AN ANTI-WAR PROGRAM THAT WILL WORK

THE power to declare aggressive war should be taken from the ruling class and deposited in the people, to be exercised by them only by direct ballot.

The power to resist actual attack in force should remain in the hands of the Congress and the President whose duty, in such circumstances, it should be to defend and protect the people of the United States without resort to special authority from the people.

In the face of threatened invasion, or of any other emergency indicating speedy attack in force, the Congress and the President should have the power, without resort to special authority from the people, to make every needful provision for defense up to, but not including, the firing of the first gun. All other military preparations made by Congress should be subject to referendum. The first gun should never be fired by the United States except by order of a majority of the qualified electors expressed by direct ballot.

The electors qualified to vote upon a proposal to declare war should consist of all the men and women in the United States more than 18 years old. War is the concern of women as much as it is of men, and if a boy 18 years of age is old enough to die for his country

he is also wise enough to know whether he wants to die.

Congress, by majority vote of the membership of each house thereof, should have the power to propose war.

War having been thus proposed, Congress should set a day for a general election throughout the United States to pass upon the proposal.

The day should not be set within 60 days from the date of the proposal, nor should it be later than six months therefrom.

The people should be given time to ponder upon the solemnity of the occasion, but it would be neither just nor prudent to permit a threat of war to hang too long over another nation.

The ballot should consist of a slip of paper upon which should be printed the question:

<p style="text-align: right; margin: 0;">NO</p> <p>Shall the United States declare war against</p> <p style="text-align: right; margin: 0;"><i>Naming the nation</i> YES</p>
--

Each voter should be required to sign his or her name opposite the word indicating his or her desire.

At each polling place, an accurate record should be kept of the numerical order in which the electors exercised the right of franchise.

In counting, the ballots cast by those desiring war should be kept apart from the ballots of those opposed to war.

Electors not voting should be regarded as having voted against war.

In the event of a majority of the men and women in the United States voting for war, the President, as the Commander-in-chief of the army and navy, should proceed to make war.

Every man who voted for war should be regarded as having thereby automatically enlisted into the army.

The President should be authorized to send to the front all of the men who voted for war, or as many thereof as he might deem necessary.

If all of the men who voted for war should prove unable to defeat the foe, the President should be authorized to select by lot and muster into service all the men who did not vote.

If still more soldiers should be required, the President should be authorized to muster into service the men who voted against war, choosing first those who voted against war latest in the day and working backward upon the lists to the first man in each precinct who voted against war, who should be the last man called upon to fight.

The President should be forbidden to send to the front any man who voted against war until every man who voted for war had been mustered into service, and the resultant army proved insufficient.

Women who vote for war should not be required to perform military service unless war would not have been declared without their votes.

If the votes of women should turn the scale toward

war, the women who voted for war should be mustered into the military service in the order in which they cast their ballots at their respective polling places. But in no circumstances should a woman who voted against war be required to perform military services.

Every writer, public speaker and public official who shall advocate war with a particular nation or group of nations should be sent to prison for not less than one year nor more than five unless he forthwith files notice of such advocacy with the President of the United States. If, within five years of such advocacy, war should take place between the United States and such nation or nations, such persons should be immediately sent to the front as common soldiers and kept on the firing line until the end of the war, unless temporarily incapacitated by wounds. Such persons, if wounded, should, upon recovery, be sent back to the front and kept there until the end of the war.

The power to formulate and execute foreign policies and to conduct negotiations with foreign powers should be taken from the President and deposited in Congress.

The present Department of State should be abolished and all of its functions transferred to a joint congressional committee on foreign relations.

This committee should consist of such equal number of members of each house as the two houses of Congress might mutually agree upon, each house electing its own representatives upon the committee.

The chairman of the committee, who should not necessarily be a member of Congress, should be elected

by the two houses in joint session. He should rank as the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the United States and should be responsible, not to the President, but to Congress.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs should have, in the disposal of minor matters and routine affairs, such latitude for individual discretion as Congress might choose to give him; but in matters of moment he should act only under the direction of Congress, as expressed directly or through the committee on foreign relations.

The Minister of Foreign Affairs should be required, not later than the close of each business day, to give to the press all the messages that he had received during the preceding 24 hours from (1) American Ambassadors, Ministers, Consuls and every other official or personal agent, by whatever title known; (2), all the messages sent during the same time to American Ambassadors, Ministers, Consuls and other agents dispatched to other nations; (3), all the dispatches received from the representatives, official or otherwise, of foreign nations and officials; (4), and all the dispatches sent to the representatives of foreign nations and officials.

It should be unlawful for anybody except the chairman of the committee on foreign affairs to communicate, in the name of the United States, with American diplomatic and consular agents abroad, or with the official or unofficial representatives of foreign governments.

It should be unlawful for the chairman of the committee on foreign relations to send verbal messages or to direct messages to any others than the persons for whom they are actually intended.

Any evasion of these provisions, either by trick or device or by failure to publish messages the same day they are received or sent, should be deemed sufficient justification for the impeachment of the chairman of the committee on foreign relations, for his removal from office and for his indictment upon a charge of felony, upon conviction of which he should be imprisoned in a federal prison for not less than one year nor more than five.

Warships, guns and ammunition should be manufactured only by the government. No individual or corporation should be permitted to have a pecuniary interest in urging preparation for war.

The foregoing is a brief outline of the program that, if adopted by the world, would banish war from the world. It is based upon the assumption that wars are fomented by individuals and that the natural tendency of people is to keep the peace. The plan, therefore, contemplates three distinct achievements:

(1) The punishment of writers, speakers and public officials who foment wars, by compelling them to be common soldiers on the firing line in any wars they may provoke;

(2) The placing of diplomacy in the daylight, to the end that the people may have full and accurate knowledge of their negotiations with other nations,

as they proceed from day to day. It is the lies told by diplomatists that inflame people who would otherwise be peaceful. It is the darkness in which diplomatists work that enables them to commit aggressions that they would not dare to attempt if their own people knew what they were doing.

(3) The equal apportionment of power and responsibility, so far as a declaration of war is concerned, among all of the American people. As matters now stand, 134 men in Congress and one man in the White House have all of the power without any of the physical responsibility, while the rest of the people have all of the physical responsibility without any of the power. The exercise of power unbalanced by responsibility tends toward the abuse of power. Responsibility for the acts of others without power to prevent the acts is an aggravated form of slavery. It is an incomparably greater assault upon justice for a few men to have the power to send all others into the field to kill human beings than it would be for a few men to have the power to send all others into the field to raise cotton or reap wheat.

It is not the contention of the writer, however, that the foregoing reaches the root of the war evil, in the sense that it reaches the cause of war. So long as men tolerate laws under which the necessities of life are subject to private ownership, so long will a few men own the necessities and so long will the greed of the few precipitate situations that will cause them to prefer war to the abandonment of their purposes.

The plan herewith proposed is an attempt to prevent a few men from sending all other men to war. It is proposed to do this by taking from the few the power to make a war-declaration and giving it not only to all men, but to all women.

If this be wrong, democracy is wrong.

If this be unnecessary, democracy is unnecessary.

If democracy is necessary to decide the tariff question, it is infinitely more needed to decide the death question.

Not every man is thoroughly informed with regard to currency and banking, but every man knows whether he wants to be shot.

Upon this question of personal preference, everyone can vote with precision and with certainty.

War is an evil of such colossal proportions that it should be curbed at the earliest possible moment. War is like a great tiger thirsting for human blood. The anti-war program here presented, which will be explained and elaborated during the following chapters, is intended to be a steel cage enveloping the tiger. The tiger once caged, we shall have time to consider the best means of killing him.

CHAPTER III

IS THE WAR REFERENDUM RIGHT IN PRINCIPLE?

MANY measures that are wrong in principle are nevertheless put into practice. We all know this. I shall, therefore, venture the assertion that anything that is right in principle can also be put into practice. To challenge this statement is to assert that wrong is practical, but right is not.

By this rule, let us measure the proposal that only the people shall declare aggressive war, that they shall declare it only by direct ballot, and that those who vote for war shall be compelled to accept responsibility for their votes by going to any wars they may make before any opponent of war shall be summoned to military service.

If this proposal be wrong in principle, the ascertainment of this fact should put an end to the proposal. If this proposal be wrong in principle, we need give no consideration to the means by which it might be applied. But if it should be demonstrated that this proposal is right in principle—if it shall be demonstrated that this proposal is based upon a great need of the human race—then we should go on. Then we should consider the means by which the principle embodied in the proposal might be put into effect.

But before any other question is settled we should settle the question of the rightness or wrongness of the contention that the people should exercise direct control of their war-making machinery. Let us settle this question first and settle it with confidence that, if the contention be sustained, we shall not lack means to carry it out. Wrong alone is not practical. Right is not less practical than wrong. Right is more practical than wrong. And, it is not less true of right than it is of wrong that "where there is a will, there is a way."

The suggestion that the war-making power be taken from the Congress and the President and deposited in the people contemplates a fundamental change in the structure of the government of the United States. Let us first ascertain what change is contemplated and then consider whether it is justified by our necessities.

The change that is contemplated in the matter of war-declarations is the substitution of direct power for delegated power. The government of the United States is solely a government of delegated powers. The governments of most of our states are not. Most of our states give the people the right to vote directly on proposed constitutions, proposed amendments to constitutions and proposals to issue bonds. In such matters, the people have refused to delegate their political powers and have insisted upon exercising them directly.

But the same people, as citizens of the United States, submit to a national government that consists solely of delegated powers.

We authorize the President to act in our behalf.

We authorize the members of Congress to act in our behalf.

As citizens of the nation, we cannot in any matter act in our own behalf. Whatever governmental function is performed in our name is done by those who exercise the powers we have delegated to them. Wherefore, we say that this is a representative government—a government administered by the people through their representatives.

But the state governments, as we have seen, are not strictly representative governments. American citizens, in their capacity as citizens of states, have not delegated all of their political powers. Let us seek the line that the American people themselves have drawn between the powers they were willing to delegate to their state governments and the powers they insisted upon exercising by direct ballot.

Let us do more than that. Let us try to discover why the American people drew the line. Why have the American people said to their state legislators: "We will delegate to you power to legislate upon this subject, but not upon that"? Why have the citizens of practically all of the states said to their legislators: "We will not delegate to you the power to say what our constitution shall be"? And, furthermore, why have the citizens of Oregon, California, Arizona and some other states said to their legislators: "We will not delegate to you any legislative power that is not

subject to our right to reverse it, at pleasure, by our votes at the polls"?

We are now approaching bedrock. Plainly, the American people, in their capacity as citizens of states, have said there were some subjects upon which they would not permit their legislators to speak for them. Precisely as plainly, the citizens of Oregon, California, Arizona and some other states have refused to delegate unqualified legislative power upon any subject. Why have citizens of states drawn a line between powers they would delegate and powers they would not?

Is not the reason for this line as plain as day? Can there be any doubt as to the reason? Have not the citizens of states, with mighty voice said: "There are some subjects so important to us that we cannot take a chance of having our representatives misrepresent us"? If not, why have the people refused to delegate to their legislators the power to make state constitutions? Why, except for the proneness of legislators to misrepresent their constituents, have the citizens of several western states refused to delegate any legislative power except upon condition that every act performed under such delegated power shall be subject to the right of the people to pass final judgment upon it at the polls?

Upon these questions, informed men cannot differ. The testimony is all one way. In their capacity as citizens of states, the American people have said there were some powers that might be safely delegated and some that might not be. They have said there were

some questions so important they dare not entrust them to representatives.

We have now taken the first step toward the finding of the truth for which we seek. The right of the people to do what they will with their political power cannot be denied. It is their power. Nor can anyone deny the right of the people to be the judges of the facts. It is for the people alone to determine what powers, if any, they may safely delegate and what they may not. And it is for the people alone to determine what subjects are so important that it would be madness to invite the risk of misrepresentation through the exercise of delegated power.

What subject is more important than war? What calamity is greater than war? What horror is greater than a war that the people do not want? What wrong is greater than a war enforced upon the many by the few? What legislative act, if performed against the people's will, could bring more misery to more millions than a declaration of war? And, if it be correct in principle and wise in practice for citizens of states to reserve the right to vote directly upon certain matters, why would it not also be correct in principle and wise in practice for citizens of the United States to reserve the right to vote directly upon a declaration of aggressive war?

Denial of this demand can in logic be based only upon the assertion that the Congress and the President can be trusted never to declare a war that the people do not want. But if representatives can so safely be

trusted in the matter of war, why should we trouble ourselves to reserve the right to vote upon state bond issues, state constitutions, amendments to state constitutions and other relatively trifling subjects, control over which we are still clutching with jealous hands?

The fact is that no legislative body can safely be trusted to give expression to the public will in any matter. Legislative bodies sometimes correctly represent the public and sometimes they do not. When legislative bodies misrepresent the public as to relatively immaterial matters, the misrepresentation can be endured, for the moment, and later corrected. But misrepresentation as to war cannot be corrected. The dead remain dead forever and the living grieve to the end of their lives.

Upon what principle of justice or expediency is this great power to declare war absolutely delegated to a few men? It is a denial of the principle that American citizens have laid down for themselves in their capacity as citizens of states. Nobody questions the correctness of the principle that the people themselves, by direct ballot, shall determine what their state constitutions shall be. If it be correct in principle to reserve the power to adopt state constitutions, would it be wrong in principle to reserve the power to declare aggressive war? Is war less important than a state constitution? If it would be unwise to let a legislature adopt a state constitution, is it wise to let a handful of men in Washington have the power to declare war? Is it only in the making of state constitutions

and other relatively trivial matters that legislators may act in opposition to the wishes of the people? If the principle of delegated power is not always to be trusted in these relatively trivial matters, is it always to be trusted in the supreme matter of war-making?

No American will question the right of the people to vote directly upon proposed state constitutions. Within a limited sphere, the principle of the referendum is well-grounded in this country. Within that sphere, the principle of the referendum is older than the country itself. It harks back to colonial days. In advocating both the right and the expediency of making war-proposals subject to a ratification by the people before they can take effect, I seek only to extend the sphere of the referendum.

We may well delegate power to perform certain legislative acts. We may well permit these acts to take effect without direct sanction of the people, though we should permit no legislative act to be performed without reserving the right to go to the polls and, by our direct votes, repeal it. But while we could not well have government without delegating some of our powers, I contend there is one power above all others that no man or woman on earth should ever delegate to any other person. I refer to the power to declare offensive war.

I am willing to delegate my power to vote upon tariff bills and currency schemes.

I am willing to delegate my power to vote upon appropriation bills and mail routes.

If those to whom I delegate such powers vote as I would not have voted, the injury done to me is not unbearable and the loss may be repaired.

But if I delegate to others the power to vote for me on a proposal to declare war, and if my representatives vote as I would not have voted, the wrong thus done may be beyond all computation and beyond all possibility of satisfactory adjustment.

The wrong thus done is not done alone to me. Even though I lose my life in a war that I regard as unjust, the wrong thus done to me may be the least of the wrongs created by the failure of my representatives to vote as I would have voted. For my failure to reserve my own war-making power, I am indicted by every corpse on every battlefield—both friend and foe. I am indicted by every orphaned child. I am indicted by every widowed mother. I am scorned by my own conscience and derided by my own intellect.

If I can speak for myself upon no other subject, I want to speak for myself upon this subject. If I must have the blood of my brothers upon my hands (and God forbid that it should be so) I demand at least the poor privilege of voting "No" in a jury composed of the whole people. And, if the majority of the jury be against me, I want each member of that majority to be compelled to put to his lips the fatal cup he has voted upon me before I shall be required to sip a drop from it.

We may now consider the second principle underlying the war-referendum proposal. Is it right to say

that the first burdens of war should fall upon those who vote for it?

Is it right to say that no man who votes against war shall be compelled to serve until every man who votes for it has been sent to the front and the resultant army proved insufficient? Is it right thus practically to grant immunity from war-service to those who vote against war, since war could not be declared by less than a majority of 40,000,000 voters, and the need for an army of more than 20,000,000 is unthinkable?

The principle that underlies this suggestion is exceedingly simple. Power should never exist except as it is balanced with responsibility. Does anyone seriously contend that power should exist without responsibility? Does it seem right in principle that one man should have the power to vote another into war without any adequate responsibility being attached to the vote?

Would you regard it as just for a man who intended to remain at home to vote you into war? Could the act of any man in voting you into war be balanced by any responsibility lighter than the necessity of going with you into the trenches and taking his chances with death? Do you want a man to vote you into war and then remain at home on the plea that he is too fat to march or to feeble to endure the hardships of war?

If men were to be permitted to vote for war and then remain at home on such pleas, what is your opinion of the likelihood that great epidemics of physical

incapacity would break out in the upper classes following a declaration of war? Do you believe the rich should be permitted to foment wars for trade or for other financial reasons and then compel the poor people to do the fighting?

I have been told that to require those who vote for war to go to war before anybody else could be summoned would be to punish men for voting for war. It is perhaps not worth while to quibble about words. "Punishment" seems to me to be not quite the right word. I prefer "responsibility." But let us assume that "punishment" is the right word. If war means punishment, who should be punished first—those who bring it or those who try to keep it away? If war be declared, some part of the community must go to the front, while the other part remains behind. Would it be better to send the peace-lovers to the front and let the fire-eaters remain at home?

Nothing is more nearly certain than the assumption that responsibility would sober jingoes. If so, responsibility of this particular physical kind would serve a highly useful purpose. As an illustration of what responsibility might be expected to do to rich jingoes, I may repeat a story that Senator Robert L. Owen of Oklahoma told me. A rich gentleman called a senator on the telephone and urged war with Mexico. The senator congratulated him upon his wisdom and—added an afterthought. Would the gentleman authorize the senator to list his name at the war department as one who, in the event of war with Mexico, would

volunteer to go to the front as a common soldier? "You go to hell," said the rich jingo—and hung up the phone.

In other words, when it was proposed that responsibility should be attached to his act, the jingo gentleman voted against war, though a moment before he had voted for it, knowing, as he did, that he intended to remain at home whatever might come.

I do not feel that the suggestion can be successfully assailed that those who vote for war should be sent to the front before anyone else. I am equally sure of the correctness of principle underlying the suggestion that declarations of aggressive war be included among the list of subjects that are regarded as too momentous to be entrusted to representatives. I am also of the opinion that it is peculiarly the duty of the Socialist Party to lead in the battle for the wider use of the referendum. The application of the principle of the referendum, as herein suggested, stands as a challenge to the Socialist Party to do its duty by living up to its ideals. The Socialist Party, in its platform declaration stands, and for years has stood, for the referendum, "nationally as well as locally."

The language in which this demand is made in the party platform is not qualified. When language is not qualified it is deemed to be inclusive. When language is inclusive it is deemed to include everything within its reasonable scope. The platform of the Socialist Party does not demand that some but not all acts of Congress shall be subject to referendum. The de-

mand is in blanket form and no act of Congress is excepted.

This platform demand of the Socialist Party either means what it says or it does not. If it does not mean what it says, no one can be certain that any other demand means what it says. The demand for the right to submit every act of Congress to public referendum is stated in no plainer terms than is the demand that the nation's great industries shall be collectively owned and democratically managed. If Socialism were to sweep the country at the next election, would any member of the Socialist Party dare declare that in demanding the public ownership of industry we did not mean to include the meat-packing industry? How dare anyone then, contend that in making an unqualified demand for the referendum, "nationally as well as locally," we did not demand the right to review every act of Congress? A declaration of war is an act of Congress. Who has the authority to make an exception where the party platform has not?

The war-referendum proposal stands as a challenge to the Socialist Party to live up to its ideals and do its duty. The Socialist Party is and always will be the party of the plain people. It is composed of plain people, it is financed by plain people and it has no other mission than to serve those who do the work of the world. Moreover, the Socialist Party hates war and loves democracy. The referendum as applied to war is nothing more nor less than the application of the democratic principle to the war machinery of the

state. It seeks not to create a public will or a public conscience, but to give the public will and the public conscience—whatever they may be—an opportunity to express themselves in a determinative way. What man or woman who believes in democracy can withhold his approval from any measure that provides a means by which the public will can assert itself upon an additional subject? And, if that subject be war—what then?

The world is tired of war. Why not provide means by which the public will may express itself in determinative fashion? People vote on many other subjects. Why not demand the right to vote on this subject that they understand? Everybody does not know that the capitalist system of industry is hell, but no one doubts that war is hell. Why protect the hell of war by sheltering it under the hands of a minority?

A cynical politician once said: "We are all in favor of democracy, but most of us are opposed to its application." Men and parties are known by the manner in which they meet tests of their faith. Every political party in this country will ultimately be tested by the answer it shall give to the demand for the democratization of war-making power. The urgency of the demand is too great to assume that any party can escape it. It has been said that not more than fifty men sent Europe to war. The world will not forever permit groups of fifty to override the peaceful desires of groups of five hundred millions.

The capitalist parties may be depended upon to

shuffle and evade the issue when the demand is first made. The other parties are in a position to shuffle. They have not expressed themselves so definitely and so unreservedly as the Socialist Party has expressed itself. The Socialist Party has not only taken an unqualified stand in its platforms, but its writers have always and everywhere preached democracy both in politics and in industry.

Mr. Morris Hillquit of New York, a Socialist long prominent in party councils, thus interpreted in his book, "*Socialism in Theory and Practice*" (p. 277), the meaning of the party demand for the referendum:

"By the 'referendum' is meant the right to compel the legislature" (that is to say, the legislative body, or Congress) "to submit to the vote of the entire people any law, ordinance or other question, to be adopted, ratified or rejected at the polls."

Mr. Hillquit is a lawyer. He has been trained to use language with care. Yet, if he had tried, he could not have framed his definition of the referendum to make it more inclusive. He did not say the referendum meant the right to review every act of Congress except a declaration of war. He framed his definition to include every act that Congress might constitutionally perform.

In the same book (p. 280), Mr. Hillquit said:

"The Socialists advocate all political reforms which have for their object the democratization of the modern state, and that not only on account of their general de-

sire for political progress, but also for the special reason that such reforms are indispensable for the progress and success of the Socialist movement."

To take the war-making power away from 134 men in Congress and one man in the White House and deposit it in a majority of all the men and women in America would certainly tend toward the democratization of the government of the United States. If Mr. Hillquit was ever right (as I believe he was) in asserting that such reforms are not only in the line of progress, but are "indispensable" to Socialist success, the assertion is not less true now than it was when he made it.

It is, therefore, to the Socialist Party that the world must look to lead the battle for the democratization of the war-making power. The Socialist Party is committed, both in politics and in industry, to the democratic principle. The Socialist Party has never yet given the world reason to doubt the sincerity of its democratic professions. The Socialist Party never will give the world such reason to doubt.

CHAPTER IV

IS THERE SUCH A THING AS AGGRESSIVE WAR?

IT is said that it would not be worth while for the people to vote on aggressive war because there is no such thing—that war is just war, neither aggressive nor defensive, and that war-seeking politicians could cause the people to vote for war by making each war in which they wished to engage appear to be a war of defense.

The foregoing criticisms of the war-referendum idea deserve the careful consideration of all those who so hate war that they wish to fight it with all their might. Let us first consider the statement that there is no way to distinguish between a war of aggression and a war of defense.

I shall venture the assertion that all the mystery that may exist as to the identity of the aggressor in any given war is due to lack of knowledge of the facts. Everything with regard to which we lack the essential facts is a mystery. Every mystery dissolves when the essential facts that underlie it are revealed. It has always been so, and reason tells us that it must always be so. Reason also tells us that nothing takes place in this universe without a reason. Therefore, there must be reasons for war and they must operate

through men. If we would understand war, we must know what is done by the men who make war. In other words, we must know what messages diplomatists send to each other. Wars come because diplomatists drop the pen and call for the sword.

All of the mystery that pertains to war will disappear when the common people of this earth know what diplomatists do and gain this knowledge as the deeds are done. The instigators of war will then stand out in a white light. Upon rare occasions we may find, as we have occasionally found in the past, that two governments were equally bent upon war. But we shall not often make such a discovery. Mere fear will prevent weak nations from opening fire upon the strong, except for the most desperate reasons, and daylight diplomacy would lay these reasons bare. Governments equally strong, though equally unscrupulous, do not often, at the same moment, desire war with each other. The government that first resorts to armed force should always be considered the aggressor in connection with the suggestion that only the people should declare aggressive war.

We should always take care to make a distinction between diplomatic aggression and military aggression. Much of the confusion of thought that has occurred in connection with the war-referendum idea is due to the failure of critics to make such a distinction. Diplomatic aggression is a subject that might well be taken into consideration by the people in determining whether

they wished to declare war, but no degree of diplomatic aggression should ever be considered sufficient to justify the minority in charge of the government in using military force on the plea that the nation had been "attacked."

No degree should be considered sufficient because what constitutes diplomatic aggression, as well as what amount of it may justify war, must ever remain matters of opinion.

No minority should be permitted to hurl two nations into war upon no other basis than its opinion that the diplomatists of the other country had gone to unbearable lengths. As a matter of theory, at least, it is conceivable that a people might justly vote for war because of the diplomatic aggressions of another country—particularly if it were plain that the people of the offending nation approved the acts of their diplomatists—but no minority in control of government should be permitted to assume such awful responsibility.

The consequences of war are so terrible that we can hardly err in going to extreme lengths to avoid it. So long as a nation is wronging us only diplomatically, we may well wait sixty days from the time that our governmental minority might feel inclined to make war, and thus give the people an opportunity to say whether they want it. The wrangling of diplomatists, while it is proceeding, is seldom of any importance to a nation, anyway. Diplomatists often become heated while they are exchanging demands and threats, but their demands touch the lives of common

people, if at all, only when the employment of military force, or the ability to exert preponderating military force, compels unwilling obedience. And a large proportion of diplomatic wrangles are of no concern to the common people, because they pertain only to the efforts of the capitalist class of one nation to gain some advantage from the capitalist class of another nation.

Every consideration of humanity, therefore, requires that diplomatic aggression should never be considered by a minority as an "attack," in the military sense of the term, and, therefore, as an act justifying the making of war by the minority. Equally plain are the grounds upon which the minority in charge of the government might justly engage in war without explicit command from the people.

So long as a people desire to retain their national existence, they must resist military attack. Military attack, instead of being a matter of opinion, is a fact. Anyone who does not wish to quibble can pass upon any given act and tell whether it was an act of war. Bombardment by a warship or a fleet is an act of war. So is armed invasion in force. But the firing of a shot over a warship's launch is not an act of war, nor is it an act of war for a few dozens of armed soldiers to cross a frontier.

The intent of a nation, so far as the making of war is concerned, may well be judged by its acts, and no nation, when it really intends to begin war, goes about it in any way except vigorously. If war is begun upon

the sea, it is not by a single shot over a cutter's bow—it is by an attack in force, either with submarines or big ships—and if the attack be made upon land, it is not made by a handful of men, but by an army.

That governments administered by capitalist minorities frequently try to shift responsibility for beginning war is no proof of the assertion that it is impossible for the common people to distinguish between wars of aggression and wars of defense. Guilty governments are able to deceive the people only because they have power to conceal facts. The people, on the other hand, have the power, if they will use it, to compel diplomatists to perform public business in the open.

War broke out in 1864 between Denmark, on one side, and Prussia and Austria on the other. If ever there was a war, responsibility for which could not be questioned, it was this war of two big nations against one little one. Yet, at the time of the war, Bismarck sharply contended that Denmark had brought it about by annexing the duchy of Schleswig, an independent province of which the King of Denmark was grand duke.

Thirty years later, when Bismarck was an old man and out of office, he wrote his memoirs and afterward printed them under the title of "*Bismarck, the Man and the Statesman.*" A long chapter is devoted to the causes of the war with Denmark over Schleswig-Holstein. Bismarck, it appears, forced the war for no other reason than to gain territory for Prussia. His task was not easy, because King William I. and

the crown prince thought him drunk or crazy when he first suggested war and pillage. I quote from Bismarck's own report (Vol. II, p. 10) of a cabinet council at which he urged upon the King war with Denmark for the sake of conquest:

"I reminded the King that every one of his immediate ancestors, not even excepting his brother, had won an increment of territory for the state . . . and I encouraged him to do likewise. This pronouncement of mine did not appear in the protocol. As Geheimrath Costenoble, who had drawn up the protocol, explained to me, when I asked him the reason of this, the King had opined that I should prefer what I had blurted out not to be embedded in protocols. His majesty seems to have imagined that I had spoken under the Bacchic influences of a *dejeuner*, and would be glad to hear no more of it. I insisted, however, upon the words being put in and they were. While I was speaking, the crown prince raised his hands to heaven as if he doubted my sanity; my colleagues remained silent."

A little later (p. 13) in speaking of the proposal to annex Holstein to Prussia, Bismarck quotes King William I. as exclaiming: "I have no right to Holstein!"

But the masterful Bismarck prevailed over the King and the crown prince, war came with Denmark, territory was gained for Prussia and Modern Germany was in the making.

"'After the Gastein convention,' wrote Bismarck (p. 20), 'and the occupation of Lauenburg, the first addition made to the kingdom under King William, his frame of mind, so far as I could observe, underwent a psychological change; he developed a taste for conquest.'"

On September 15, 1865, the King, who thought Bismarck was drunk because he proposed a war of conquest against Denmark, wrote Bismarck the following letter :

“Today full possession is taken of the Duchy of Lauenburg, an act resulting from the great and admirable insight and circumspection with which you have adhered to my government. During the four years since I called you to the head of the government of the state, Prussia has won a position that is worthy of her history, and promises her, moreover, further fortune and glory yet to come. In order to express my thanks and bear open testimony to your distinguished services, for which I have so often had occasion to express my thanks, I hereby raise you and your descendants to the rank of count, a distinction which will, at any rate, prove how high my appreciation was of your services to your country. Your affectionate king,

“WILLIAM.”

In the light of the facts belatedly admitted by Bismarck, we may ask these questions:

May wars waged for territorial aggrandizement properly be called wars of aggression?

If so, was not the war waged against Denmark a war of aggression?

If Bismarck had told everybody, in 1864, what he told the King at the ministerial council, would anybody have doubted that a war of aggression was waged against Denmark by Prussia and Austria?

Is it true that there is no such thing as an aggressive or a defensive war—that “war is just war”?

“During the time that I was in office,” wrote Bis-

marck (Vol. 2, p. 293), "I advised three wars, the Danish, the Bohemian and the French."

The war with Denmark was ended by what was known as the Treaty of Gastein, under which Prussia and Austria were to have joint control of most of the territory gained as a result of the war. That we may judge whether the war between Prussia and Austria was "just a war" or whether there was an aggressor, let us consider the following paragraph from "*Europe Since 1815*," by Professor Charles Downer Hazen (p. 260):

"Bismarck approved the Treaty of Gastein because, in his opinion, it ended nothing. He called it a mere 'stopping of cracks.' He regarded it simply as a new trick in the game with Austria. That the convention was universally denounced abroad and in Germany as merely cold-blooded bargaining was a matter of indifference to him. Out of the situation which it created he hoped to bring about the war with Austria which he had desired for the past ten years as being the only means whereby German unity could be achieved by Prussia and for its advantage. In this he was successful within a year."

If the foregoing statements are true, the war between Prussia and Austria was a war of aggression waged by Prussia. Bismarck himself gives what amounts to the testimony of the crown prince in the matter. The dramatic incident that he sketches occurred during the war between Prussia and Austria. The Prussian armies had won great victories and the military party, headed by the King himself, wanted to go on. Bismarck was in great fear of intervention

by one or more European Powers and wanted to stop the war before they could interfere. Bismarck's insistence upon making peace "excited the King to such a degree that a prolongation of the discussion became impossible." The King was determined to go on with the war, and Bismarck left his presence determined to resign his post and join the army. Bismarck adds (Vol. II, p. 53):

"On returning to my room I was in the mood that the thought occurred to me whether it would not be better to fall out of the open window, which was four stories high, and I did not look round when I heard the door open, although I suspected that the person entering was the crown prince, whose room, in the same corridor, I had just passed. I felt my hand on his shoulder while he said: 'You know that I was against this war. You considered it necessary, and the responsibility for it lies on you. If you are now persuaded that our end is attained, and peace must now be concluded, I am ready to support you and defend your opinion with my father.'"

So, we have the statement of Professor Hazen that Bismarck had desired war with Austria for ten years before he finally brought it about; the statement of the Prussian crown prince that responsibility for the war lay on Bismarck, and the admission of Bismarck himself that he "advised" it.

In the light of such testimony, is there any doubt that Prussia was the diplomatic aggressor? Bismarck was always clever enough to jockey his opponent into a false position. He placed the odium of actually beginning war upon Austria. But we now know that

Bismarck diplomatically provoked the war, and that a minority in Austria took the responsibility of resisting Bismarck's diplomatic aggression by force of arms. The responsibility for the war, therefore, rests upon the ruling classes of Prussia and Austria. Bismarck, merely by diplomatic pressure, could not have compelled an attack from Austria if the Austrian minority in charge of the government had not joined with equally small minorities in other German kingdoms in a declaration of war upon Prussia.

The Franco-German war of 1870 also offers interesting material bearing upon the question of whether there be such a thing as a war of aggression. Though hundreds of thousands of men were killed and wounded in the great conflict between France and Germany, the world does not yet fully know why the war took place! Professor Hazen, in "*Europe Since 1915*," written 39 years after the war, thus begins a chapter on the diplomacy that led to the conflict:

"Concerning that diplomacy, much is known, but much remains obscure. Not until the archives of France and Germany, the papers of Napoleon III., William I., Bismarck and their ministers and agents are freely given to the world will it stand forth fully revealed. Yet, fragmentary and unsatisfactory as our information is, the broad outlines of the story can be drawn with reasonable certitude."

A little later (p. 293) Professor Hazen says:

"The war grew directly out of mere diplomatic fencing. The French people did not desire it, only the people

of Paris, inflamed by an official press. Indeed, until it was declared, the French people hardly knew of the matter of dispute. It came upon them unexpectedly. The war was made by the responsible heads of two governments. It was, in its origin, in no sense national in either country. Its immediate occasion was trivial. But it was the cause of a remarkable display of patriotism in both countries."

The fact is that France had long been ruled by an exceedingly brutal and unscrupulous military party. Thomas Carlyle wrote a letter to the London *Times* in which he expressed the hope that Germany would win the war and thus "crush out militarism in France." The incident that was seized upon by the French military party as the occasion for making trouble with Germany was the action of the Spanish ministry in calling Leopold, hereditary prince of Hohenzollern, to the Spanish throne. The French military party made such an outcry that, to keep the peace, the prince announced he would not accept the crown.

Of course, the matter was of no consequence, either way, to the common people of France and Germany. When a peasant is trying to dig his living out of the soil, it does not much matter to him who sits upon the throne of a neighboring kingdom. At any rate, the act of the Hohenzollern prince in stepping aside should have ended the matter, as it would have ended it if the people of France had controlled their diplomacy.

The military party of France, however, were not

so easily satisfied. They had set out to look for trouble and must find it. The French Ambassador to Germany was dispatched to Ems, a watering place where King William was sojourning, to make a further demand. King William was asked to bind himself never at any future time to give his approval to the candidature of a Hohenzollern for the Spanish throne. The King's secretary reported the event to Bismarck in Berlin in the following telegram:

“His majesty writes to me: ‘Count Benedetti’ (the French ambassador) ‘spoke to me on the promenade in order to demand from me, finally in a very importunate manner, that I should authorize him to telegraph at once that I bound myself for all future time never again to give my consent if the Hohenzollerns should renew their candidature. I refused, at last somewhat sternly, as it is neither right nor possible to undertake engagements of this kind *a tout jamais*. Naturally, I told him that I had as yet received no news, and as he was earlier informed about Paris and Madrid than myself, he could clearly see that my government once more had no hand in the matter.’ His majesty has since received a letter from the prince. His majesty having told Count Benedetti that he was awaiting news from the prince, has decided, with reference to the above demand, upon the representation of Count Eulenburg and myself, not to receive Count Benedetti again, but only to let him be informed through an aide-de-camp; that his majesty had now received from the prince confirmation of the news which Benedetti had already received from Paris, and had nothing further to say to the ambassador. His majesty leaves it to your excellency whether Benedetti's fresh demand and its rejection should not be at once communicated both to our ambassadors and to the press.”

The withdrawal of the Hohenzollern candidature so humiliated Bismarck that he determined to resign his post.

"We had got our slap in the face from France," he wrote, "and had been reduced by our complaisance to look like seekers of a quarrel if we entered upon war, the only way in which we could wipe away the stain."

Bismarck saw no hope of war and, intending to resign, telegraphed his family that he would soon be home. "I took it for granted," he wrote, "that France would lay the prince's renunciation to her account as a satisfactory success. . . . I was very much depressed."

Then came the King's telegram from Ems, which reached Berlin a little after 6 o'clock. Count Von Moltke, Chief of Staff of the Army, and Albrecht Von Roon, Minister of War, were dining with Bismarck. "Both were greatly depressed," wrote Bismarck, "and reproached me indirectly of selfishly availing myself of my greater facility for withdrawing from service."

Bismarck read the telegram to his guests "whose dejection was so great that they turned away from food and drink." Bismarck's alert mind instantly caught the line in which he was authorized to communicate the telegram to the press. The idea of how he might bring about war had come to him.

"I put a few questions to Von Moltke," he wrote, "as to the extent of his confidence in the state of our

preparations, especially as to the time they would still require in order to meet the sudden risk of war."

Von Moltke replied that if there were to be war, Germany could gain nothing by waiting, and that if, at the beginning, Germany should be unable to protect her entire frontier along the Rhine, she could nevertheless gather strength more rapidly than could France. Von Moltke, according to Bismarck, "regarded a rapid outbreak as, on the whole, more favorable to us than delay."

Bismarck also wrote that he gave consideration to the thought that "the gulf which diverse dynastic and family influences and different habits of life had in the course of history created between the south and north of the Fatherland could not be more effectually bridged over than by a joint national war against the neighbor who had been aggressive for many centuries."

Then Bismarck, in the presence of his guests, "reduced the (Ems) telegram by striking out words, but without adding or altering," and gave it to the press in the following form:

"After the news of the renunciation of the hereditary prince of Hohenzollern had been officially communicated to the imperial government of France by the royal government of Spain, the French ambassador at Ems further demanded of his majesty that he would authorize him to telegraph to Paris that his majesty, the king, bound himself for all future time never again to give his consent if the Hohenzollerns should renew their candidature. His majesty, the king, thereupon decided not to

receive the French ambassador again, and sent to tell him through the aide-de-camp on duty that his majesty had nothing further to communicate to the ambassador."

"Now it has a different ring," Bismarck quotes Von Moltke as saying. "It sounded before like a parley; now it is like a flourish in answer to a challenge." Bismarck also said that although he had only condensed the telegram he knew that in its new form it would "have the effect of a red rag upon the Gallic bull."

"Fight we must," he quotes himself as saying to Von Moltke, "if we do not want to act the part of the vanquished without a battle. Success, however, essentially depends upon the impression which the origination of the war makes upon us and others; it is important that we should be the party attacked, and this Gallic overweening and touchiness will make us, if we announce in the face of Europe, so far as we can without the speaking-tube of the reichstag, that we fearlessly meet the public threats of France."

With the sending of the condensed telegram, Bismarck said that his sombre guests became joyous and lively. "They had suddenly recovered their pleasure in eating and drinking and spoke in a more cheerful vein. Roon said: 'Our God of old still lives and will not let us perish in disgrace.' Moltke . . . smote his hand upon his breast and said: 'If I may but live to lead our armies in such a war, then the devil may come directly afterwards and fetch away the old carcass.' . . . I found my military colleague in the King's service changed from his usual dry and

silent habit, cheerful, lively, I might even say merry, . . . his love of combat and delight in battles were a great support to me in carrying out the policy I regarded as necessary. . . .”

And the war between France and Germany came on precisely as Bismarck would have had it come. *“It is important that we should be the party attacked,”* he said to Von Moltke after the Ems telegram had been “doctored” and sent away to be the red rag to the Gallic bull. The French military party sprung the trap and declared war.

Where shall we seek a finer example of a terrible war brought about by diplomatists? The pretext for the war amounted to nothing, so far as the common people of both nations were concerned. The French people hardly knew about the row until it broke into blood. The French people were the victims of their military party which controlled, not only their diplomatic machinery, but their military machinery. The Germans, too, were the victims of their diplomatic machinery. The original Ems telegram sounded so un-warlike that Von Moltke, who wanted war, turned away from his food when it was read to him.

What if there had been a law in Germany that would have compelled Bismarck to publish the original Ems telegram or be impeached, removed from office and sent to prison?

What if the people of both France and Germany had known at the time of the nature of the trick that was being perpetrated upon them?

If the people of both nations had known the facts and neither nation could declare war except by vote of the people, is it likely there would have been war?

But the ruling classes of Germany and France are not the only ones that deceive their people with regard to the causes of war. Benjamin Franklin, in writing to an English friend in 1789, said: "I believe governments are pretty nearly equal in honesty, and cannot with propriety praise their own in preference to that of their neighbors."

CHAPTER V

WARS OF AGGRESSION THAT WERE MADE IN ENGLAND AND AMERICA

IF the world wanted war, it would not be worth while to talk peace. It seems worth while to talk peace because it appears certain that the world is tired of war. If it be true that the world is sick unto death of war, the fact that war persists is proof that the world's will is set at naught by a few.

Why not, then, take from the few the power to break peace? Why not provide that aggressive war shall be declared only by vote of the people? If the people want peace, why not give them an opportunity to vote for peace? Why not take from the minority the control of all war-making machinery? Could the minority make war against the will of the people if they lacked the power to begin a battle upon land or sea?

A few gentlemen who believe in the right of the people to vote upon every other governmental matter do not believe it would do any good for the people to demand and get the right to vote upon the question of declaring aggressive war. These gentlemen say there is no such thing as aggressive war—that war is just war.

A hundred years ago, much the same views were held with regard to bubonic plague and other deadly diseases. Nobody was ever held responsible for carrying a disease from one house to another. The entire calamity was charged to God. But, as we have come to know more about certain diseases, our tendency has been to blame God less and man more. God has not changed. Diseases have not changed. Man has not changed. Nothing has happened except that some of the facts pertaining to diseases have become known.

It is the contention of the present writer that wars do not happen, that they are made by men, and that knowledge of the facts would show who these men are. It is the custom of diplomatists to make wars and then misrepresent the facts upon which the wars are based. Historians know this, if the common people do not. Historians have this truth thrust upon them in the search for the materials out of which history is made. Facts are denied them. They are told, in effect, to go away and return, perhaps, in a hundred years.

As to this point, the testimony of Professor William M. Sloane of Columbia University is pertinent. I quote from an extended article about Professor Sloane that was published in the *New York Times* on September 20, 1914, in which he said:

“Having been accustomed to reading, all my life, long diplomatic documents, really having been trained, you might say, almost in the school of Ranke, who was the inaugurator of an entirely new school of historical

writing based on the criticism of historical papers, I have come to realize that the dispatches of trained diplomats are for the most part purely formal, and that while these respective applications of Great Britain and of Germany have a certain value, yet, nevertheless, the most important plans are laid in the embrasures of windows, where important men stand and talk so that no one can hear, or they are arranged and oftentimes amplified in private correspondence which does not see the light until years afterward, and that the most important historical documents are found in the archives of families, members of which have been the guiding spirits of European policy and politics.

“So that what the secret diplomacy of the last years may have been is utterly unknown, and certainly will not be known for the generation yet to come and perhaps for several generations. The student in almost any European capital is given complete access to everything on file in the archives, including secret documents, only down to a certain date. That date differs in various of these storehouses, but I think in no case is it later than 1830!”

We have here the word of an historian that diplomats, when they are committing the acts that lead to war, palm off whatever they please upon the public and suppress the rest. In a subsequent chapter, I shall consider whether such practices should be stopped and whether they can be stopped. The question that presses now, however, is this: “If the people, at the outbreak of war, knew the facts that diplomatists suppress, is it not likely that the people would be able to see an aggressor in each struggle and to name him?”

In the preceding chapter was shown Bismarck's absolute responsibility for two wars and his exceed-

ingly close connection with responsibility for a third. Long after the bones of his victims had mouldered in the grave, Bismarck told the truth as to why they died and took responsibility. But if Germany, under Bismarck, waged two wars of aggression, she did not thereby place herself in a peculiar class among nations. All great nations have waged wars of aggression. The hands of the United States are by no means clean. Great Britain's arms are red to the shoulders. No empire could be so far-flung as the British empire without taint of innocent blood. England's history is in no small part composed of the story of her aggressions against weaker peoples. Does any sane person believe that the war between Great Britain and the Boer republics in 1899 was "just a war"? The archives of the Boer war are still closed. The exact facts may not be known for another half century. Yet, from the beginning, circumstances pointed so plainly to Great Britain as the aggressor that the verdict of the world has never wavered.

The United States, for no better reason than England's reason for fighting the Boers, once committed as great a crime. The time was during the administration of President Polk. The victim was Mexico. Mr. Polk was a Southern Democrat. Southern Democrats were exceedingly interested in devising ways and means to tighten the hold of chattel slavery upon the government of the United States. A war of conquest against Mexico was deemed advisable, inas-

much as it would yield territory out of which additional slave states might be erected.

The Government, of course, made no such admissions. As every government does in such circumstances, the administration of President Polk, representing the slave-holding oligarchy of the South, misrepresented the facts. It was contended that Mexico "attacked" the United States while American troops were engaged in the peaceful pursuit of occupying Texas, which had just come into the union of its own free will. It was not explained that Americans had brought about the secession of Texas from Mexico.

Ulysses S. Grant fought in the war against Mexico. After he had twice been President of the United States he wrote a book in which he told what he thought about the war. The following paragraphs are taken from his "*Memoirs*":

"My duties kept me on the frontier of Louisiana with the army of observation; and, afterward, I was absent from home during the war with Mexico, provoked by the action of the army if not by the annexation itself" (p. 35).

"Ostensibly we were intended to prevent filibustering into Texas, but really as a menace to Mexico in case she appeared to contemplate war. Generally, the officers of the army were indifferent whether the annexation was consummated or not; but not so all of them. For myself, I was bitterly opposed to the measure, and to this day, regard the war which resulted as one of the most unjust ever waged by a stronger against a weaker nation. It was an instance of a republic following the bad example of European monarchies in not considering justice in their desire to acquire additional territory" (p. 37).

“Texas was originally a state belonging to the republic of Mexico. It extended from the Sabine river on the east to the Rio Grande on the west, and from the Gulf of Mexico on the south and east to the territory of the United States and New Mexico—another Mexican state at that time—on the north and west. An empire in territory, it had but a very sparse population, until settled by Americans who had received authority from Mexico to colonize. These colonists paid very little attention to the supreme government, and introduced slavery into the state almost from the start, though the constitution of Mexico did not, nor does it now, sanction that institution. Soon they set up an independent government of their own, and war existed between Texas and Mexico in name from that time until 1836, when active hostilities very nearly ceased upon the capture of Santa Anna, the Mexican president.

“Before long, however, the same people—who with permission of Mexico had colonized Texas, and afterwards set up slavery there, and then seceded as soon as they felt strong enough to do so—offered themselves and the state to the United States, and in 1845, their offer was accepted. The occupation, separation and annexation were, from the inception of the movement to its final consummation, a conspiracy to acquire territory out of which slave states might be formed for the American union” (p. 37).

“Even if the annexation itself could be justified, the manner in which the subsequent war was forced upon Mexico cannot” (p. 38).

“In taking possession of Texas after annexation, the army of occupation, under General Taylor, was directed to occupy the disputed territory. The army did not stop at the Nueces and offer to negotiate for a settlement of the boundary question, but went beyond, apparently in order to force Mexico to initiate war” (p. 38).

“The Southern Rebellion was largely the outgrowth of the Mexican War. Nations like individuals are punished for their transgressions. We got our punishment in the

most sanguinary and expensive war of modern times" (p. 38).

"The presence of United States troops on the edge of the disputed territory furthest from the Mexican settlement was not sufficient to provoke hostilities. We were sent to provoke a fight, but it was essential that Mexico should commence it. It was very doubtful whether Congress would declare war; but if Mexico should attack our troops, the executive could announce, 'Whereas war exists, by the acts of,' etc., and prosecute the contest with vigor. . . . Mexico showing no willingness to drive the invaders from her soil, it became necessary for the invaders to approach to within a convenient distance to be struck. Accordingly, preparations were begun for moving the army to the Rio Grande, to a point near Matamoras" (p. 45).

General Grant, in his old age, made the foregoing charges against the United States Government. The truth of his charges is beyond question. Americans settled in Texas, as Englishmen settled in the Boer republics, to acquire property interests and then make trouble. In each case, when trouble came, the real wrong-doer tried to shift the responsibility for war to the shoulders of his weaker adversary. The Southern slave owners did not quite dare go to the length of declaring war on Mexico, because they feared public sentiment would not support them. So the Southern gentlemen adopted the more crafty method of sending an army into the disputed territory to "provoke a fight," and when the fight did not come, the army was advanced to a point where it would be more likely "to be struck."

Mexico was finally goaded into battle, and the

Southern slave holders sent forth the word that the United States had been "attacked." The American people believed the lie because they did not know the facts. If the Government of the United States had been compelled to conduct its business with Mexico and Texas in the daylight, the facts would have come out and the people could not have been deceived. The fact would have been as plain to everybody as it was to Ulysses S. Grant that the South sought war with Mexico for the purpose of gaining territory from which slave states might be erected.

The Spanish-American War was plainly a war of aggression on the part of the United States. The American people were deceived by their own Government when they were induced to wage the war. The purpose of the conflict was represented to be to "free Cuba" and "avenge the *Maine*." Seventeen years after the war, it is still impossible to declare with certainty what were its real causes. A steadily accumulating body of facts prove only that the alleged causes were not the true ones.

Professor Roland G. Usher, associate professor of history in Washington University, St. Louis, throws some light on the situation in a book entitled "*Pan-Germanism*." He declares that for several years prior to the outbreak of the Spanish-American War, France and Great Britain had been extremely fearful lest Germany should try to strip Spain of her colonies. Spain had Cuba, Porto Rico and the Philippines and was weak. Germany had no colony that was worth

much, wanted colonies and was strong. Professor Usher declares Germany suspected the Spanish-American War was brought about by Great Britain and France to prevent Germany from seizing Spain's colonies.

"There was, furthermore," he says, "a likelihood that Germany would in some way attempt the annexation of the oldest of European colonial empires, held at this time by one of the weakest and most decadent of European states. The Spanish colonies in the Gulf of Mexico and the Philippine Islands possessed not only commercial but strategic importance. The wealth of Cuba and Porto Rico was proverbial, the products of the Philippines considerable, and, though not altogether suitable for colonization, they would afford Germany undeniable opportunity for expansion.

"Moreover, Cuba in the hands of Germany would rob Jamaica of all naval importance and might actually permit Germany to overrun the whole gulf. The Philippines, as a matter of fact, controlled one whole side of the China Sea and contained valuable seaports, where a naval base could be established, safe from assault by the Chinese or European nations. The islands were thus ideally fitted to become Germany's base of operations in the Far East.

"To allow such places to fall into her hands might entail consequences whose far-reaching effect no statesman could possibly imagine. Nor was there the slightest guarantee that, by any unprovoked assault, Germany would not attempt to take possession. At the same time, the general European situation and the position of Spain in the Mediterranean made it impossible for England or France to undertake a war with her, without setting fire to a train of circumstances whose eventual results might be even more fatal than those they were attempting to prevent.

"The colonial aspirations of the United States, her

anxiety to share in the opening of China to European enterprise, her traditional hope of securing control of Cuba, all pointed to her as the natural guardian of the interests of the coalition in the Gulf of Mexico and in the Far East. Whether or not it is true, as some assert—a view to which certain events lend probability—that the Spanish-American War was created in order to permit the United States to take possession of Spain's colonial dominion, certainly such was the result of that war. To be sure, the relations between Spain and the United States were already strained; popular sentiment was aroused by the conditions in Cuba, and if the war was 'created,' it was not a difficult task. Certainly Germany and her allies suspected that such was the purpose of the war and attempted to secure a general agreement in Europe to interfere in Spain's favor. England, however, whether because she saw its advantage, now the war was in existence, or because she had caused it to be begun, decisively vetoed the suggestion of interference, and her control of the sea made action without co-operation impossible." *

The important fact for Americans to consider is that 17 years after we went to war, we do not know why we went. The passing years have served only to prove that for some reason or reasons (and not the ones given at the time) the United States Government was determined to go to war. America now stands plainly forth as the aggressor and, in 50 years, perhaps a former President will be able to give the facts about the Spanish-American War with as much freedom as Grant gave the facts about the war with Mexico. The German version, indeed, may prove to have some foundation.

* "*Pan-Germanism*," Houghton Mifflin Company, p. 150.

German suspicions, as set forth by Professor Usher, seem to throw light upon a number of incidents connected with the Spanish-American War that, until now, were shrouded in mystery. After the battle of Manila, a number of powers, according to international custom, each sent a small number of warships to the scene to observe developments. Germany sent a considerable squadron under Admiral von Diederichs. If Germany suspected that the war was brought about by European rivals to give the United States colonies that might otherwise be seized by Germany, the presence of the large German squadron is explained. Apparently there was no reason why Germany should have sent so many ships to Manila, or why the commander of the ships should have persisted in violating Admiral Dewey's blockade regulations until Dewey was compelled to tell him that he would fire upon him if he did not desist.

Newspaper readers may remember that, when the relations between Admirals Dewey and Von Diederichs became strained, Admiral Chichester, the commander of the British naval force at Manila, was reported to have visited Dewey upon his flagship and told him that in case of trouble with the German squadron, the British ships would be placed at the disposal of the American commander. The report may or may not have been true, but it was never denied by Dewey or the British Government.

Newspaper readers will also remember the suddenness with which the news of the battle of Manila broke

upon America. Public attention had been turned toward impending developments in the West Indies. The thought of conquering and holding the Philippine Islands had not been publicly discussed, and the people were dazed when they read that Dewey had placed the islands in their grasp. But while America was still talking about Dewey's victory, and before any consideration had been given to the question of whether we should keep the islands, a London dispatch to the Associated Press, two days after the battle, declared that the people of England assumed that the United States would, "of course," keep the Philippines. Why was Admiral Chichester so kind to Admiral Dewey? Why did Britons discover, even before we ourselves discovered it, that we would "of course" hold what Dewey had won?

But the conviction that the United States Government was the aggressor in the war against Spain is based upon something more than suspicion. The United States Government, in 1903, published a "*Report of the Foreign Relations of the United States*" for a period that included the diplomatic negotiations preceding the war with Spain. This report, which not one American in ten thousand has yet read or ever will read, shows that on February 26, 1898, the American Minister to Spain, General Stewart L. Woodford, reported in writing to President McKinley that he had obtained the "practical adjustment of every problem" committed to him.

On April 3, 1898, Minister Woodford cabled from Madrid to President McKinley as follows (p. 732):

"If conditions at Washington still enable you to give me the necessary time, I am sure that before next October I will get peace in Cuba with justice to Cuba and protection to our great American interests. I know that the Queen and her ministry sincerely desire peace, and that if you can give me time and reasonable liberty of action, I will get for you the peace you desire so much, and for which you have labored so hard."

On April 10, Minister Woodford again cabled President McKinley, repeated the foregoing sentiments and added:

"I hope that nothing will be done to humiliate Spain, as I am satisfied that the present government is going, and is loyally ready to go, as fast and as far as it can. With your power of action sufficiently free, you will win the fight on your own lines."

Yet on April 19, Congress ordered armed intervention in Cuba, and, three days later, adopted a resolution in which it was declared that "war exists." Why? Because Spain had destroyed the *Maine*? Because Spain would not yield to the American demands with regard to Cuba? Not at all. Spain had yielded to all of our demands—had yielded not only to one set of demands, but to others as Mr. McKinley kept piling them in. The destruction of the *Maine* had, it is true, inflamed the American people to a frenzy, but passing years have served only to indicate that the outburst of passion against Spain was unjustified and that the

McKinley administration perhaps had a reason for sitting quietly by while the yellow press fanned the flames. After the war, it was all but impossible to get the United States Government to raise the wreck of the *Maine*. The bodies of the dead sailors for whom the nation had fought were permitted to lie in the muck of Havana harbor for ten long years. A cofferdam was eventually built around the spot and all the water pumped out. The wreck of the *Maine* lay exposed. The surrounding muck was taken away. Not a sign of a mine or of a cable leading to a mine was found. The hull was patched and it was announced through the press that the *Maine* would be brought back to the United States and maintained as a national memento. The *Maine* was made able to float, but instead of appearing in the United States, it was suddenly announced that, because of unseaworthiness, she would be taken to sea and sunk. Taken to sea, she was. And, under so many fathoms of water that human eye can never again see her, the ship for which we went to war lies in her ocean grave. Not a particle of evidence has ever been found to prove that the Spanish Government destroyed the *Maine*, or that anybody destroyed it. In 1898, an investigating commission declared that the ship's plates were bent inward, indicating an exterior explosion, but when the wreck was exhumed, no trace of a mine was found. No responsible person would today declare that the Spanish Government destroyed the *Maine*.

The Johns Hopkins University Press, in 1906, published a pamphlet by Mr. Horace Edgar Flack, entitled "*Spanish-American Diplomatic Relations Preceding the War of 1898.*" Mr. Flack makes an exceedingly critical analysis, not only of the *Maine* affair, but of the negotiations with regard to Cuba. He recalls the offer of the Spanish Government to submit the matter of the *Maine* to an impartial tribunal, by the verdict of which Spain offered to agree to be bound; notes the statement of Mr. McKinley to Congress that he had ignored the proposal, and then asks why? Says Mr. Flack:

"The internal evidence and the later facts seem to give only one answer, and that is that our government had practically decided on war and that the *Maine* question was considered the best thing to arouse popular enthusiasm. This will explain why our government, which has generally seemed so favorable to arbitration, was unwilling to submit the *Maine* to an impartial tribunal."

Mr. Flack quotes the protest of the Spanish Minister of State against the submission to the American Congress of the report of the American board of inquiry, without giving Spain the slightest opportunity to prove her innocence, and adds:

"There can be no question that this was a true and valid criticism. . . . We cannot but conclude that the action of our government was indefensible, even if it was fully convinced that the ship was destroyed by a torpedo or a mine, for that fact would certainly not fix responsibility upon Spain. A government is only held to exercise due diligence in preventing injury to others, and just as

our government held that it was impossible to prevent filibustering expeditions altogether—could not guarantee that there would be none—neither could Spain guarantee absolutely that no injury would be done our battleship. Even if negligence on the part of the Spanish Government could be shown, still there would be hardly any justification for war, especially since the Spanish Government proposed to abide by the decision of a neutral tribunal, and so was willing to make amends.”

Mr. Flack quotes from the messages sent by Minister Woodford to President McKinley to prove that Spain had granted demand after demand in an effort to avoid war. The United States Government demanded the withdrawal of the reconcentrado order. Spain withdrew it. The United States demanded that the belligerents agree upon an armistice. Spain said she would willingly grant one if the Cubans should request it, but her pride forbade her to grant what the rebels had not asked. As warlike preparations proceeded in America, Spain pocketed her pride and proclaimed an unasked armistice. The armistice was announced on April 9. On April 8, Minister Woodford had cabled to the President:

“The sober sense of Spain is slowly but surely coming to the front, and a few days (if these days can still be had) will see a crystallized public sentiment that will sustain the present Spanish Government, if that Government has the courage to do at once the things that are necessary for peace.”

“But these few days,” says Mr. Flack, “were not given, though the Spanish Government did act imme-

diately and courageously, for the die was cast when the President sent his message to Congress on April 11."

Mr. Flack offers no suggestions as to the real reasons why the Government of the United States, in 1898, waged an aggressive war against Spain. He only uses the diplomatic correspondence, made public long after the war, to show that the reasons given were not the true reasons. If the private journals and private correspondence of William McKinley, John Sherman, Mark Hanna and some of their associates shall ever become public, we shall doubtless know why we forced war upon Spain.

The capture of Vera Cruz in the spring of 1914, by order of President Wilson, was also an act of aggression, and if war had followed, the war would have been a war of aggression on the part of the Government of the United States. Vera Cruz was captured because General Huerta, before sundown on a certain Sunday evening in April, did not salute the United States flag. The specific offense of General Huerta's government was that some of its soldiers had arrested American marines who went ashore for their ships' mail.

Considerable exaggeration would be required to prove that the arrest of a few sailors was an attack upon the United States Navy and, therefore, the beginning of a war of Mexican aggression. But the storming and seizure of Vera Cruz was an act of war and an act of aggressive war. The Government

of the United States was guilty of it, and if the laws had so provided, the people could have been given an opportunity to vote on the question as to whether Huerta's refusal to salute our flag should be followed with war against Mexico. If the people had voted on a proposal to "Remember the *Maine*" by waging war against Spain, it is probable that they would have voted for war—but that suggests jingo editors and what should be their responsibility for inflaming peoples.

CHAPTER VI

THE PLACE TO STRIKE THE FIRST BLOW AGAINST WAR

MINORITIES embroil nations in quarrels and bring about unwarranted wars. The world is tired of war. Where should we strike the first blow to bring perpetual peace?

The logic of the situation points to one answer. Secret diplomacy should be done to death. Daylight diplomacy should take its place. The power to formulate and execute foreign policies should be placed under direct control of the people. It is largely because the diplomatic function has not been democratized that small groups are still able to bring about war. It is by the exercise of two forms of political power that minorities precipitate war. The power to formulate and execute foreign policies is one of these powers. The power to declare war is the other.

It is at this point I differ from those who contend that the only way to rid the world of war is to rid it of the industrial system that causes minorities to seek war.

I maintain that the absorption, by the people, of the political powers with which minorities make war will prevent them from making it.

I assert that the history of the progress of popu-

lar government is little more than the history of the capture by the people of political powers once held by minorities. The capitalist system does not fall every time the people wrest from the capitalist class an additional political power, but the fact that such powers can be captured, even before the system can be supplanted with something better, is demonstrated again and again.

The history of government in that part of North America in which we live is little more than the history of political powers conquered by the people from the ruling class.

The casting of a ballot is a political power, yet in colonial days, property qualifications and other requirements were erected as barriers to keep the masses away from the polls. The fight to capture the political power that we know as suffrage was not won by the last American man until nearly one hundred years after the formation of the government—and but few women have captured it yet.

To vote for Presidential electors is to exercise a political power, yet for many years after the Government was established, few citizens had such power. State legislatures, for the most part, chose the members of the electoral college. Without waiting for the capitalist system to fall, the people captured the political power to elect Presidential electors. The people, indeed, did more. They captured all the political power held by the electoral college by depriving its members of the right to exercise their individual judg-

ment in the selection of President and Vice-President.

The election of judges is a political power, once held solely by minorities. The President and the Senate still select all Federal judges, but the people have captured the political power to choose state judges.

The election of United States Senators is a political power that was held for 125 years by the legislatures of states. The legislatures of states no longer hold it. The people have captured it.

The capitalist system exists both in Russia and in England, but England is more nearly democratic than Russia, because the people of England have captured from their ruling class more political powers than the people of Russia have captured.

I propose that the principle of conquest be carried a step further by capturing the political powers with which the capitalist class foments and declares war.

The ruling class incentive to create wars cannot be destroyed without destroying the capitalist system, but the ability of capitalist minorities to exercise their warlike desires can be destroyed by taking from them the political powers with which they make war.

If I believed it would be easier to destroy the system that causes a few to desire war than it would be to deprive the few of the means by which they gratify their desire, I should combat war only by advocating the destruction of the capitalist system.

But history shows it is easier to wrest from the

capitalist minority political powers they have assumed than it is to destroy the system itself.

I believe the system should and will be supplanted by a system of industry that will be infinitely better, but if war can be abolished even before the capitalist system can be ended, I am in favor of making war quit the world first. War is too great an evil to be tolerated a day longer than is necessary.

I believe war can be made to quit the world first. Moreover, the loss of the war-making power would unquestionably hasten the collapse of the capitalist system. Foreign war has ever been a favorite ruling-class method of drowning demands for internal reforms. When the people are about to insist upon their rights, they are sent to war to forget them.

A nation's foreign policies should not be formulated and executed in the dark. No man or group of men constituting a minority should have the power to determine what a nation's foreign policies shall be. The people, at all times, should have the power to order the abandonment of foreign policies already in operation, and to initiate new ones. This power should be exercised by direct ballot.

Only an absolute monarch can declare war. The President of the United States is not an absolute monarch, but he often has the power to make war inevitable. The President's control over our foreign policies gives him the power to provoke war. The Constitution of the United States does not give the President the power to formulate and execute the

nation's foreign policies, but he does both. Under the Constitution, the President's right to such powers is, at most, an implied right. The Constitution gives the President and the Senate the power to appoint Ambassadors, Ministers and Consuls, but it does not say whether the President, the Senate, or both, shall formulate the policies that our representatives abroad shall execute.

The Constitution does not even say there shall be a Department of State or a Secretary of State. The department and the secretary are both creatures of Congress.

But while written law is silent, unwritten law gives the President sole power to formulate and execute American foreign policies. The Senate, though it shares with the President the power to appoint diplomatic officials, never presumes to fix the policies such officials shall execute. Diplomatic officials regard themselves and are regarded by others as creatures of the President. The President has both the power to nominate and to remove them. The President also has the power to nominate and remove the Secretary of State.

In practice, if not in constitutional law, the power of the President to formulate and execute the nation's foreign policies is unlimited. The President, if he had been so disposed, could have compelled the United States to take part in the great war in Europe. The power to formulate foreign policies gave him such power. Hardly a day passed without an incident that

might have been used as a pretext. All the nations accused each other of violating the rules of war. Some of the nations were charged with violating provisions of The Hague agreement that the United States, jointly with other powers, is pledged to maintain. Floating mines sent adrift by one of the belligerents blew up American ships, and warships of other belligerents captured American ships. Great Britain and Germany, whenever it suited their purpose to do so, threw international law to the winds. If the President of the United States had desired war, he could have forced it with a minimum of effort. A little insulting diplomacy, together with the sending of warships abroad "to protect our interests," would have touched the spark to the powder.

That the President, in this instance, sought peace rather than war is no justification of his power to make war. Peace is too precious and war too horrible to entrust the question of war or peace to any one man. The security of a nation should be founded on something more stable than the good intentions or the ability of any individual. The people themselves should have the power to keep the peace. They cannot have such power until they take from the President the power to formulate and execute foreign policies and vest it in Congress, reserving, meanwhile, the power to reverse Congress by referendum if it shall seem desirable to do so.

Furthermore, it is by no means true that every

President can be trusted not to abuse the great diplomatic power reposed in him.

According to Ulysses S. Grant, President Polk used his diplomatic and military powers to provoke war with Mexico.

According to the late Stewart L. Woodford who, in 1898, was Minister to Spain, war could have been prevented if President McKinley had been willing to tell Congress and the country what Mr. Woodford told the President ten days before war came—that a little more time would yield a bloodless victory for the United States.

President Wilson, in April, 1914, almost if not quite violated the Constitution by ordering the commission of an act of war against Mexico—the seizure of Vera Cruz—merely because General Huerta refused, within a given time, to salute the American flag. That war did not follow the President's act was merely because Mexico was too weak and disorganized to fight.

What is true of the United States with respect to the control of diplomatic functions by a minority, is true in greater or lesser measure of every other nation. The people of no nation control their diplomatic relationships with the government of any other nation. But in few great nations, aside from absolute monarchies, is the power to formulate and execute foreign policies vested, as it is in the United States, in one man. Moreover, in Europe, custom requires that records of diplomatic exchanges be speedily published in the form of "blue books" or "white books,"

while in the United States there is no such custom and there exists the greatest uncertainty and irregularity in the publication of diplomatic correspondence. The correspondence preceding the Spanish-American War was not published until 1903. In 1915, the correspondence between Mr. Taft and Henry Lane Wilson, American Ambassador to Mexico, is still unpublished, though the period of Mr. Wilson's ambassadorship included the stormy days that led to the assassination of President Madero. Nor has the correspondence between President Wilson and John Lind yet been published, though it was the failure of Mr. Lind's meddling mission that ultimately brought about the attack upon Vera Cruz. Mr. Lind went abroad upon public business, but his activities were cloaked under all of the secrecy that might have surrounded private business. The Government at Washington published only such information as it pleased.

A new principle should be introduced into diplomacy—the principle of instantaneous publicity. If it were a requirement of law that all correspondence, both incoming and outgoing, should be made immediately available for publication, the character of diplomatic communications would be speedily changed. Diplomats would not dare do in the open what they now do in the dark. If the people had the right to vote upon the question of war they would instantly develop such an interest as they have never had in the foreign relationships of their nation. Except in crises, the people now have little interest in foreign affairs,

because they have no responsibility for their conduct. But if the people were to seize the power to shape diplomatic courses and the power to declare war, they would note with the gravest concern any tendency of their government toward diplomatic aggression.

"It is so easy," said J. Ramsey MacDonald, a member of the British parliament, "for diplomatists to commit countries in such a way that their very existence is jeopardized, and then turn to the citizens and say: 'Unless you fight, the enemy will batter down your gates and reduce you to a state of subjection.'"

If diplomacy were brought out into the open, diplomatists could not juggle nations into death-traps. The people would not be left unwarned of the danger of war until it was too late. The daily publication of dispatches would reveal the first sign of diplomatic aggression.

Critics have said that diplomatists would not obey the law if they were required to publish all dispatches upon the day of their transmission or receipt. Critics have not carefully considered the nature of such a law. Its enforcement would not depend upon the administration that violated it. The power to enforce the law would always lie in the nation which might be the object of unjust attack by the Government of the United States. No American official would ever have an incentive to suppress a dispatch that he considered just. An unjust dispatch that had been suppressed need only be published in America by the government that received it. American public opinion would compel the

enforcement of the law. Any nation that the Government of the United States might be wronging would naturally, through its ambassador in Washington, make a daily comparison of the messages it received and the messages that the American Government admitted having sent. The moment the law was violated, the aggrieved government would have the Government of the United States in its power. The ambassador of the foreign nation would naturally proceed to lay the suppressed dispatch before the American people, through the press. So many newspapers would be eager to print proof of the criminality of an administration that no newspaper would think it worth while to try to suppress the facts.

No administration could stand up under such proof of guilt. However much it might be disposed to shelter the guilty head of our Department of Foreign Relations, it would not dare to do so. Public sentiment would compel his impeachment and removal from office, his indictment, trial, conviction and imprisonment upon a felony charge.

It seems exceedingly improbable that any high official would ever place himself so completely at the mercy of his enemy. If not, the law requiring immediate publication of all diplomatic dispatches would be obeyed.

Secret diplomacy can be abolished. Unfortunately, jingoes cannot be. But they can be held accountable for their acts. Publishers, editors, writers, public speakers and public officials who incite war can be

compelled to serve as common soldiers in any wars they may incite. It can be legally declared that to advocate a policy of aggression toward a nation is to incite war. The period can also be legally fixed in which responsibility for a given utterance shall exist. The people may say that if war with a particular nation shall follow within two years or five years of the advocacy of aggression toward the nation, the author of the advice shall be required to prove his sincerity and his disinterested patriotism by going to the front. It would be a simple matter to require all publishers and writers of articles advocating aggression to send their names and addresses and copies of their articles to the war department, and to report changes of address for five years following each article. The threat of a fine and imprisonment for not making such reports would insure observance of the law, because the publicity attendant upon publication would make knowledge of the facts widespread.

It would be still simpler to hold publishers responsible for the acts of their writers and to hold writers responsible for their own acts. Breathing war from a newspaper skyscraper would be a less popular diversion if it carried with it the certainty that, in the event of war, both writer and publisher would breathe smoke on the battlefield.

Jingoes can be sobered without first destroying the capitalist system. The people are ready for the application of the remedy. Congress can apply it. It

would be unnecessary even to amend the federal constitution.

It has been argued that to compel writers and public speakers to take part in such wars as they might incite would be to violate the rights of free speech and a free press. This criticism need not be taken seriously. When free speech and freedom of the press become no more than the right to preach race hatred and mass murder, they will have become "rights" unworthy of preservation.

The absurdity of the criticism is more sharply revealed, however, by an analysis of its legal aspects. Why should there be no responsibility for wronging a nation when there is already so much responsibility for wronging an individual? One who advocates the murder of an individual becomes, in the event of crime following his advice, an accessory before the fact, equally guilty with the actual murderer. Why should one who advocates a crime against two nations (his own and another) escape all responsibility?

No power should exist without responsibility, and the greater the power the greater should be the responsibility. We should probably not electrocute men who advocate war, but we can with perfect propriety demand that they shall take the medicine they prescribe for others. Indeed, the world's safety requires that we shall do so. Jingo journalism and jingo oratory are the handmaidens of secret diplomacy—the bloody trio of modern civilization.

CHAPTER VII

WAR-LIKE PEOPLES AND PEACE-LOVING RULERS

THE war-referendum plan has been criticised on the ground that it would tend to give a popular sanction to war. This criticism has been made by those who so object to war that they would withhold from it every vestige of public approval.

Such critics fail to perceive the purpose of the plan. I do not advocate the war-referendum for the purpose of giving to wholesale murder any degree of respectability that it now lacks. Nor do I advocate the war-referendum to increase the ease with which war might be declared. I urge the people to take over the war-making power because I believe they would seldom or never use it. If I believed the people were more blood-thirsty than their masters, I should prefer that their masters retain the power to make war. I am opposed to the retention of such power by the masters, because I believe they are more war-like than the people.

The master class has selfish reasons for engaging in war. The people have none.

The master class finds war tolerable, or they would end it. The people find war horrible and should end it.

The people have the desire to end war—the masters have not. If the popular horror of war were made effective, war would be no more.

I contend that the popular horror of war can be made effective. If no aggressive war could be begun except by direct vote of the people, the popular horror of war would be effective. The master class would be disarmed. It could not fire a gun on land or sea. The people could fire every gun on land and sea, but if they had a horror of war, they would not do so.

It would be far better if there were nowhere any guns to fire, but the guns are here. So long as they are here, the control over them must rest somewhere. If the majority do not seize this power, the minority will retain it. I urge the seizure of this power by the majority to prevent the minority from using it. If the people are peaceful, I am right. If the people are less war-like than their masters, the people, if they had the war-making power, would make fewer wars than their masters make.

An exceedingly important principle underlies this phase of the subject. Any governmental act that must be done quickly should be the function of an individual, or at most, of a few men. There may be instances where the objections would outweigh the advantages of such a distribution of power, but in the main, the principle is correct. However powerful may be the public will, once it is placed in operation,

it cannot assert itself quickly. Democratic government is proverbially slow to get into action.

If there were no other reason for placing the war-making power in the hands of the people, it should be done for this reason. Aggressive war should never be begun quickly. Here the public lethargy may well be turned to account. To attack another nation is almost if not always to do wrong, and nothing can ever be lost by postponing the day of wrongdoing. If there be justification for attacking another nation, the justification must necessarily be so deep-seated that it will last until the people have voted. Justification that would not last sixty days would not be justification.

If other nations soon learned that the people of the United States invariably voted against aggressive war, the proposal of war by Congress would not so alarm our prospective victim that it would strike at us while we were preparing to vote.

The people themselves, if left to themselves, are everywhere opposed to war. Professor Muensterberg, in a book entitled "*America and the War*" makes the statement that it is the kings and kaisers who are opposed to war and that within the last twenty-five years, the governments of Europe have several times thwarted the wish of the people to engage in war.

It is unfortunately true that scheming diplomatists and jingo journalists have the power so to inflame peoples that they desire war. It is even more certainly true that the ruling class of each nation knows

that the people at heart want peace. The ruling class of no nation dares to trust the people to wage the wars in which the ruling class wishes to engage.

If the ruling class of Germany trusts the people of Germany to wage all the wars in which the ruling class wishes to engage, why is there compulsory military service in Germany?

Why is there compulsory military service in France?

Why does Great Britain, whenever she cannot get enough volunteers, resort to conscription?

Why has the Government of the United States enacted the Dick military law under the terms of which, in the event of war, the President has the power to demand and compel military service from every able-bodied citizen between the ages of eighteen and forty-five years?

Why does the Government of the United States, whenever it cannot get enough volunteers, resort to the draft?

Why were there draft riots in New York City and elsewhere during the Civil War?

If the people are so war-like and the rulers are so peaceful, why do the peaceful rulers everywhere take such pains that the war-like people shall not be permitted to remain at peace?

A series of advertisements printed by the British Government in the leading London reviews throw a strong light upon the foregoing questions. The British Government, on August 4, 1914, embarked upon the greatest war in the world's history. It was with

difficulty, however, that the men of the British Isles were induced to embark in the war by enlisting. An American who returned from London in September said: "Everybody in England is urging everybody else to go to war." War-like banners were flung across the streets; taxicabs chugged along bearing the legend: "Your country needs you. Go to the front. God save the King." Public monuments were draped with similar admonitions—yet after the first flush of excitement following the outbreak of war, enlistments dwindled to insignificant proportions.

London newspapers gravely discussed the public lethargy. "It is believed," said one, "that when the cold weather sets in, many of the homeless unemployed will see the wisdom of seeking shelter at the front." The youth of the land were roundly scolded for their attendance upon sporting events. It was shameful that young men should prefer cricket or the seashore to the performance of their solemn duty in the trenches. Zeppelin raids, from time to time, stimulated enlistments, as did the German attacks upon the seacoast towns of eastern England. Yet, the British Government nevertheless felt it necessary to accelerate the process of transferring men from peace to war by printing in London newspapers and periodicals a series of advertisements of a most remarkable nature. They were remarkable not alone for their admission that the British ruling class is conscious of the necessity of urging common people to fight—they were remarkable because of their unconscious revelation of ruling class

character. Artemus Ward was willing to sacrifice all of his wife's relations to put down the bloody rebellion—but Artemus did not exceed in sacrificial spirit the British ruling class of today. Measured by its unblushing impudence, the following advertisement from *The Spectator* of January 23, 1915, stands high:

Five Questions to Those Who Employ Male Servants.

1. Have you a butler, groom, chauffeur, gardener, or gamekeeper serving you who at this moment should be serving your king and country?

2. Have you a man serving at your table who should be serving a gun?

3. Have you a man digging your garden who should be digging trenches?

4. Have you a man driving your car who should be driving a transport wagon?

5. Have you a man preserving your game who should be helping to preserve your country?

A great responsibility rests on you. Will you sacrifice your personal convenience for your country's need?

Ask your men to enlist TODAY.

The address of the nearest recruiting office can be obtained at any postoffice.

God save the King.

Not a suggestion that the comfortable, affluent gentlemen to whom the advertisement was addressed should themselves go away to be killed—only an urgent appeal to them to induce their servants to enlist "today." The British Government solemnly tells the British rich man that "a great responsibility rests on

you"—the responsibility of doing without his flunkeys in order that they might lose their lives, if need be, in the protection of the master's property.

The Nation, of London, on January 30, 1915, published an advertisement that, among other things, rather clearly defines the master class definition of patriotism, so far as it pertains to the master class. Read:

An Appeal to Patriotic Employers.

As an employer have you seen that every fit man under your control that can possibly be spared has been given every opportunity of enlisting?

Will you call your employes together today, and explain to them that in order to end the war quickly we must have more men?

Many more men would enlist if you explained to them what you are prepared to do for them whilst they are fighting for the empire.

They will listen to you—use your influence and help to end the war.

Call your men together—today.

Your country will appreciate the help you give.

God save the King.

The British Government's idea of the way for a rich Briton to be a patriot is to induce the poor men who work for him to go to war, and he is assured that "your country will appreciate the help you give." But the British Government's idea of the way a poor man should go about it to become a patriot is revealed in the following advertisement from *The Spectator* of February 13, 1915:

To the Men of England.

Your country knows that it is no light sacrifice that she demands of you.

You are not blamed for letting others, who felt the call more keenly, get in ahead of you. But now it is your turn to play the man; if you do so, we will not think the less of you because you could not go sooner.

Remember this, if you don't go willingly today, you and your children, and your children's children, may have to go unwillingly to wars even more terrible than this one.

Your country wants you NOW.

Enlist today!

God save the King.

This is what might be called a liberal proposition. The gates of hell are opened to the humblest, while nobody who enters is to be blamed because he did not enter earlier. Benevolence in government could hardly go further.

The revelation of British ruling class mind is but an incident, however, of the foregoing advertisements. The fact that they prove beyond all question is that the British people *are not as war-like as their masters*. The publication by the government of the advertisements is an official admission that in the face of the greatest war in England's history, the English people must be coaxed to fight.

Yet nothing could be further from the truth than the conclusion that the Englishman is lacking in courage. No braver man walks the earth. The point is that until conscription begins, the Englishman is left free to exercise his own judgment. His judgment is,

in the main, that he should stay at home. If the Frenchman and the German were different, it would be unnecessary for the governments of France and Germany to make military service compulsory. If the American were different, the Dick law would be unnecessary.

The people of America are so peaceful that if the people of the South had controlled their war-making power there would have been no Civil War. Historians on both sides of Mason and Dixon's line have so obscured the facts concerning the war's beginning that the present generation has lost sight of what were the realities. Certain matters cannot be blotted out, though they may be, as they are, ignored. A most significant fact is that five months after the first secession ordinance was introduced in a Southern legislature, so few states had seceded that the plan to form a Southern Confederacy seemed doomed to certain failure.

Horace Greeley told the whole story in a history of the Civil War * that he published immediately after the close of the conflict. The following statements are taken from pages 450 and 632 of the first volume of Greeley's history.

Secession ordinances were introduced in the legislatures of the 15 Southern states. Seven of the states adopted ordinances. The other eight balked. Five months after the seven seceded, the other eight were

* "*The American Conflict*," two vols., published 1865, by O. D. Case & Co., Hartford, Conn.

still in the Union. Tennessee, Arkansas and most of the border states had, by overwhelming vote, refused to secede. Of the border states, Kentucky, Maryland and Delaware consented to consider the question further, but took no action. It began to look as if none of the other states would take action.

The secession of a few states, however, had paralyzed the business of the South by destroying its credit in the North. In a practical sense, the South was neither in the Union nor out of it, and had none of the advantages which either position would have given it. The situation was so grave that the Southern leaders decided to resort to extreme measures to revive the languishing secession movement and force the South out of the Union.

Mr. Greeley tells what those measures were and quotes, as his authority, Jere Clemens, who, before the war, was a United States senator from Alabama. Clemens spoke at a unionist meeting that was held at Huntsville, Alabama, on March 13, 1864. Greeley quotes Clemens as follows:

“Before I declare this meeting adjourned, I wish to state a fact in relationship to the commencement of the war. Some time after the ordinance of secession was passed, I was in Montgomery and called upon President Davis, who was in the city. Davis, Memminger, the secretary of war, Gilchrist, the member from Lowndes county and several others were present. As I entered the conversation ceased. They were evidently discussing the firing upon Fort Sumter. Two or three of them withdrew to a corner of the room, and I heard Gilchrist say to the secre-

tary of war: 'It must be done. Delay two months and Alabama stays in the Union. *You must sprinkle blood in the faces of the people.'*'"

Forthwith blood was "sprinkled." Fort Sumter was fired upon. The Federal Government, feeling compelled to protect its property, resisted the attack. The people of the South were told by their leaders that the resistance of the North constituted an attack upon the South. Then came the war. Blood had been "sprinkled in the faces of the people." States that in time of peace had been opposed to secession, as well as states that had been so indifferent toward it that they would not sanction it, drew away from the Union after President Lincoln called for 75,000 volunteers to recover Fort Sumter and put down the insurrection.

From these facts it appears that the war between the states was not brought about by the hot-headed impetuosity of the Southern people. The masses in the South, then as now, were poor people, struggling to make a living. They owned no slaves, nor ever expected to own any. They had their little homes and their little occupations, and the controversy about slavery so slightly concerned them that they were unwilling to withdraw from the Union to erect a slave nation. They accepted war only when they believed they had been attacked. They believed they had been attacked only because they did not know the facts.

It would not have been within the power of the Southern leaders to precipitate the conflict if it had been a recognized principle in the South that no

war should be begun except by direct vote of the people. The firing upon Fort Sumter was an act of war. How likely is it that in states where even secession ordinances could not be passed through legislatures, the people would have voted to fire upon a federal fort? What Southerner, even now, believes Abraham Lincoln would ever have attacked the South? Yet Lincoln, in 1861, was the same man that all the world now knows him to have been. The Southern people, in 1861, did not know Lincoln. Their leaders would not let them know him. Yet Lincoln was there to be known. The Southern people simply lacked the machinery for finding out the facts.

The great, unnecessary war between the North and the South affords a powerful illustration of the need of daylight diplomacy. If it had been an accepted principle in the South that diplomatic affairs should be conducted in the open, the South would have demanded full knowledge of all the steps that led to the war. Strictly speaking, of course, the South, prior to the war, had no diplomatic relationships with any government. Southern leaders, however, were performing acts that had all of the ominous significance of the gravest diplomatic acts. There were negotiations between states that regarded themselves as independent, sovereign states. Jefferson Davis of Mississippi was in communication with Alexander H. Stephens of Georgia. Their communications were essentially of a diplomatic nature. The people of the whole South—at any rate, the people of the two states

immediately concerned—should have known every word that passed between these two men.

Of course, if all the negotiations of the Southern leaders had been conducted in the open, it would not have been possible to precipitate the rebellion. It is not the custom of minorities to hatch rebellions in the open. But that is a fact that minorities, rather than majorities, should regret—the fact that publicity would block them.

It is easy enough to conceive situations in which daylight diplomacy would be a positive detriment. But it would be difficult to lay down a principle, however nearly just and advantageous in the main, that in some conceivable circumstances might not work badly. But in 99 cases out of 100, daylight diplomacy would serve public interests. Secret diplomacy is the means by which minorities foment and bring about wars. As between the two, an informed public can have but one choice. Moreover, if the people ever take the power to vote on war, they should have daylight diplomacy to provide them with the information with which to vote intelligently.

Some critics of the war-referendum plan have been much concerned lest the people, if they had the power to vote war, should vote wrong. It has even been argued that the people should not have the power to vote on war because of the probability that they would vote wrong. One critic offered the defeat of an eight-hour law, when submitted to a referendum of the peo-

ple of California, as proof of the inability of the people to recognize their interests when they vote.

Such criticism, if made by the Czar of Russia, would be quite understandable. It is quite impossible to understand when made in America. Democrats believe Republicans vote wrong; Republicans believe Democrats vote wrong; Progressives believe both Republicans and Democrats vote wrong, and Socialists believe everybody but Socialists vote wrong—yet we find it possible to tolerate each other's exercise of the franchise upon the theory that the public welfare requires that we rule ourselves as well as we can, even if we make mistakes. We prefer such degree of self-rule as we can get to any autocratic government.

CHAPTER VIII

SOCIALISM AND THE WAR REFERENDUM

A MEMBER of the Socialist Party whose opinions are always worthy of consideration, agrees in principle with the war-referendum plan, but doubts the advisability of advocating it. He says: "I am inclined to think that when we have power enough to add your plan to the constitution, we shall come pretty nearly having enough power to make a new constitution." Other Socialists have put the same idea into the question: "Would it not be as difficult to get a capitalist Congress to agree to relinquish the war-making power as it would be to get a capitalist Congress to install Socialism?"

Such criticism is interesting. If it is well-based, I should abandon the advocacy of the war-referendum and confine myself to the advocacy of Socialism, in which I also believe. If it is not well-based, other Socialists should advocate the war-referendum in addition to Socialism. I welcome the issue and shall proceed to demonstrate that the criticism is not well-based.

Let us make our starting-point a fact, as to the truth of which we can all agree. That fact is:

The people have the power to do what they will with their government.

The people can destroy their government. They can knock down part of it and let the rest stand. They can capture all the political power of the capitalist class or they can capture part of it. They can take some of the principles of capitalism out of the constitution and put in some of the principles of Socialism, or they can take out all of the principles of capitalism and put in all of the principles of Socialism. So far as determining the structure of government is concerned, there is nothing the people cannot do.

But none of these things can be done unless there be first desire, and after desire must come agreement as to the method that shall be pursued to accomplish it. First, the people must want to do a thing and then a majority must agree as to how they shall proceed to do it.

Let us make a careful comparison of the chief purpose of Socialism and the chief purpose of the war-referendum plan.

The chief purpose of Socialism is to enable the people to carry on industry without exploitation of labor.

The chief purpose of the war-referendum plan is to enable the people, the world over, to prevent insignificant minorities, or minorities of whatever size, from precipitating wars against the wishes of the people.

Each of these purposes is sufficient to introduce into the public mind the element of desire, which must

precede every attempt to change the structure of government. The people desire that the robbery of the many by the few shall be ended. The people desire that the power of a few to embroil millions in war shall be ended. So far as the element of desire is concerned, Socialism and the war referendum are on equal terms. The people are in favor of the purpose of each program.

We have now progressed one step in the search for the correct answer to our question, which is: Is it likely that the war-referendum idea could be enacted into law much if any before the whole Socialist program could be enacted? We have recalled that the wresting from the minority of any political power must be preceded by popular desire, and that desire must be followed by agreement as to the method that shall be pursued to gain the desired end.

We are now ready to take the second step, which has to do with the problem of uniting a majority upon a particular method of accomplishing a general desire. What are the factors in a program that tend to unite a majority?

First, the majority must be convinced that the program, if enacted into law, would accomplish the desired result.

The majority, too, must be convinced that the advantages of a program would be greater than its disadvantages, and that it is possible to place the program in effect within a reasonable time.

Measured by these tests, I know of no reason why

the program of Socialism should not make a perfect appeal not only to the people of America, but to the people of the world. I believe Socialism would end poverty, without creating any evil whatever in its place, and I know of nothing that can prevent the inauguration of Socialism, once the people order it to be installed.

But in these matters, the great majority of the people do not agree with me. Why? All but an insignificant minority earnestly desire to end robbery, but the great majority have yet to be convinced that the Socialist remedy for robbery is the correct one.

Remember, now, that neither the Socialist program nor the war-referendum program can become effective until at least a majority of the people believe both in its efficacy and its practicability. Let us place the two programs side by side and consider which is likely to conquer the public mind first.

To prevent a few from robbing everybody else, the Socialist Party demands the public ownership and democratic management of all the means of production and distribution that are collectively operated.

To prevent a few from embroiling millions in wars they do not want, the war referendum demands that secret diplomacy give way to democratized diplomacy; that only the people, by direct ballot, shall have the power to declare war; that in the event of war, those who voted for it shall be the first ones to be sent to the front, and that women as well as men shall have the right to vote on a proposal to declare war.

I perceive no flaw in the Socialist program that should account for the failure of the people to turn to it *en masse*. It is a program that reaches to the roots of our civilization, but the wrongs we are trying to eradicate also reach to the roots of our civilization, and no shorter program would reach the wrongs. A tree that is grounded in fifty feet of gravel cannot be pulled down with a shoestring. We Socialists realize only too well the depths to which the roots of the capitalist tree descend, and though we regret that we cannot uproot this monster with a toothpick, we submit, with entire confidence, an explosive that we believe will uproot it. That explosive is the public ownership and democratic management of the things of which and with which the necessaries of life are collectively produced. Private ownership is the weapon with which the industrial grafter grafts. We purpose to take his weapon from him. We do not see how he could steal without a weapon. Neither does the grafter, evidently, see how he could steal, because he is doing his very best to cling to his weapon—which is the ownership of the things we all must use to live.

It is, however, an unfortunate fact that the mere statement of the Socialist program is not sufficient to carry conviction to all who hear it. That is not the fault of the program—it is the misfortune of the people. It is the misfortune of the people that they so often take counsel of their fears, rather than their hopes. The Socialist program contemplates a profound change in the basis of society. We ourselves

boldly proclaim that we are "revolutionists," meaning thereby that we are intent upon bringing, by means of the ballot, a revolution in the existing world that will put the people on top of it. We should be frauds if we did not proclaim the revolutionary character of our purposes.

But the very stupendousness of our program (and it could not be less if it were to be effective) stuns and silences the man who hears it for the first time. Everybody is said to be a coward at 2 o'clock in the morning, and a great many of us are cowards at noon. Blistered by the present, we nevertheless shrink from change. We feel that to change means to sail out in the dark upon an unknown sea. A few figuratively lash themselves to the mast, as Farragut did when he sailed up Mobile Bay, and like Farragut shout: "Damn the torpedoes—go ahead!" It is in this spirit that all discovery, social and otherwise, has been made. The way to unknown lands is not led by weaklings. The star of implicit belief must ever be enough to light the leaders on. They must have but one passion and that must be to discover a new world. And the world of plenty which Socialists seek is not to be had for the asking. It is a world that is not to be received as a gift, but a world that must be taken as a prize.

It is inspiring to read of the exploits of discoverers and pioneers. As we follow them, line by line, our hearts and our hopes leap with their hopes. But there is a peculiarity in human nature that causes most

persons to glut their desire for discovery and exploration by reading about it. The average man holds back. He believes either that the trip is not worth while or that it is attended with too many dangers. Regardless of the particular reason by which he is moved, he permits the pioneer to precede him, and where the dauntless lead today, the laggards go tomorrow.

The disciples of graft have exhausted their resources in an effort to make the way to Socialism appear to be a plunge into a jungle inhabited only by man-eating tigers and boa-constrictors. Upon each side of what is really a broad highway, these grafters have set up dummy horrors in much the same manner that a scene shifter sets a stage. One horrible monster, stuffed with straw, carries in suspension from its neck the placard: "Socialism Would Destroy Initiative." A boa-constrictor made of mud conveys the intelligence that "You will have to change human nature to make Socialism work." Other placards read: "If you were to divide everything equally today, a few would have almost everything tomorrow;" "If the government owned everything, the politicians would ruin everything;" "Socialism would destroy individuality;" "Socialism would mean tyranny;" "Socialism might be a good thing, but it cannot be brought about in less than a thousand years—and in the meantime, vote for Bunko and Steerer, labor's friends."

Granted that these "monsters" are all fakes. Admit that they are. Admit, also, that the people will ulti-

mately discover that the fakes are fakes. It is nevertheless a fact, highly important for our present purposes, that the people have not yet been convinced of the fraudulent character of these dummies and, because of them, are keeping off the Socialist highway. We are at present trying to determine whether it would be possible to convert a majority of the people to the war-referendum plan much, if any, before it will be possible to convert them to Socialism. The extent to which it is possible to misrepresent Socialism is therefore an important factor to consider.

Is it possible to misrepresent the war-referendum plan as much as it is possible to misrepresent Socialism? If it is, it will be idle further to discuss the war referendum, because, with the coming of worldwide Socialism, war will end.

Let us take the first demand of the war-referendum program—that no war be begun except by direct vote of all the men and women of the nation in which war is proposed.

What is there in that demand that is open to easy misrepresentation?

Can anyone be convinced that to take the war-making power away from fifty men in Europe and 135 men in the United States would destroy the home, or destroy initiative, or require a change of human nature, or strew the world with sorrow and suffering? What is to be the basis of the misrepresentation? Is it to be that the people do not know enough to vote in favor of their own interests? Let anyone who de-

sires, seek thus to misrepresent the plan. The person to whom he makes it may be implicitly trusted to estimate the misrepresentation at its real worth. No man or woman will ever admit that he or she would not be able to vote intelligently upon the matter of war. Few persons will admit that they cannot vote intelligently upon anything. Moreover, if the principle is to be established that the people are to be permitted to vote only upon the questions that they understand, who is to determine for the people what they understand and what they do not? Anyone who should try to attack the war-referendum on this ground would immediately find himself in trouble.

Is the plan to be misrepresented because it would give to Congress and the President the power they already have to resist attack? Let anybody who would fly-speck this demand move to amend by providing that in case of attack we should do nothing for sixty days until the people had voted. We must repel attack without voting or repel it after voting—one or the other.

Is there opportunity for successful misrepresentation in the proposal that Congress and the President, without consulting the people, should have the power to prepare for emergencies? Congress and the President now prepare for emergencies and the people have no referendum upon any act of Congress. I propose that Congress and the President have the power to prepare for emergencies and that the people have the right to submit any and every act of Congress

to referendum. Would there be much force in the contention that if Congress and the President were given authority to provide for real emergencies, subject to popular referendum if there were time and the people so desired, that Congress and the President would have the power to plunge the nation into militarism and plead that they were only providing for an emergency? What would the people be doing with their referendum power? Would they be silent and inactive while the Government was piling up armaments against the popular will?

What convincing criticism could be made of the proposal that those who might vote for war should be sent to the front, in the event of war, in the order in which they voted, and that nobody who voted against war should be called upon to serve until every war-maker had served and the resultant army proved insufficient? If the people should vote for war, part of the people would at once have to go to war. Is it likely that anyone who opposed war would be prejudiced against the war-referendum plan merely because it would send the war-makers to the front first? Would a young man who wanted to live be prejudiced against the plan merely because it would send to the front first any old man who might feel inclined to vote the young man into war?

It is not pleasant to think of an old man in battle. It is not pleasant to think of a young man in battle. If the old man votes for battle and the young man votes for peace, which should be in battle first? In

these days of trench warfare, any man who is physically able to ride from point to point on troop trains and, eight times an hour, raise his head above the trench and fire toward the enemy, is competent to be a soldier. A fat, apoplectic broker probably could not stand trench life as well as a young, sinewy farmer. Let the broker vote for peace, then. Do you believe a peace-loving young farmer could be prejudiced against the war-referendum plan merely because, in the event of the broker and a majority voting for war, the broker would be required to go into the trenches while the farmer remained at home? Try it on a farmer and see. I may be wrong. Perhaps he would insist upon going in the broker's place.

Is it possible successfully to misrepresent the war-referendum plan merely because it proposes that all war-ballots shall be signed by those who cast them? We believe, on general principles, in a secret ballot. Why? Is it not because we believe a secret ballot is in our interest? Exactly so. What we seek, then, is the advancement of our interests.

Suppose, in the matter of war, it should appear that our interests would be best served by a signed ballot. Should we still cling to secrecy when it had become a danger rather than a safeguard? Suppose you had voted against war and were therefore entitled to remain at home until every advocate of war had been mustered into service and been whipped to a standstill. Would you be interested in proving by the signature on your ballot that you had voted against war?

Would you repudiate the whole plan merely because somebody told you that no war-ballot should be signed? Would you prefer, in the event of conscription, to be drafted and sent to the front while millions of men who voted for war skulked behind their unsigned ballots and remained at home while you fought?

Do you believe war should be made, if at all, in secret or in open? How could war by ballot be made in the open if the ballots were not signed? Do you believe employers who wanted war would discharge employées who voted for peace? Suppose the nation voted for peace—do you believe a few employers could discharge the nation? Suppose only ten or fifteen million men and women should vote for peace and the other twenty million should vote for war—do you think a few capitalists would discharge the ten or fifteen millions? How long do you believe it would be before revolution would overrun a land in which the normal army of unemployed had been suddenly increased by the discharge of ten or fifteen millions, whose only crime was that they had voted against war?

Is it probable that the people could be much prejudiced against the war-referendum plan because it would make secret diplomacy a felony, and give Congress (subject to popular referendum) the power to formulate and execute foreign policies? The making of a foreign policy is often the making of war. Why should the question of whether we are to remain at

peace be solely dependent upon how the President feels about the matter? The President now has the sole power to make and execute foreign policies. If we are protected, he protects us. Why should we not have the power to protect ourselves? Is it probable that any considerable number of persons could be unalterably prejudiced against the war-referendum plan, merely because one of its proposals seeks to give the people power to protect themselves? Or, might the people be expected to object because it is demanded that the jingoes be compelled to fight in any wars they may create?

We are now prepared to sum up the facts we have considered. The people are opposed to poverty and industrial robbery, and we Socialists tell them that Socialism will end both poverty and industrial robbery. The people are opposed to wars fomented against their will by minorities. The advocates of the war-referendum plan declare that if diplomacy were democratized and the war-making power vested in the people themselves, no war could be begun for which the people had not voted.

If the war-referendum program is less susceptible to misrepresentation than the Socialist plan, it can command a majority of the people more quickly than can the Socialist program.

From a knowledge of both programs, I contend that the war-referendum plan is simpler than the Socialist program, much more likely to carry conviction with the mere statement of it, and much more difficult

to misrepresent. The Socialist program goes to the roots of government and industry. The war-referendum program goes to the roots of but two functions of government—diplomacy and war. A part of a thing is always less than the whole of it—that is why the war-referendum plan is less than the Socialist program and therefore more easily understood.

Whatever the people are determined to do with government, they can do. Nothing can stand in the way of the demands of a united, insistent people. All the people want about the same things but have difficulty in agreeing upon a way of getting them. The people are tired of poverty and tired of war, and the question is whether the Socialist plan of ending poverty and war or the war-referendum plan of ending war is, in its nature, most likely to lead in making its way into the public understanding.

Perhaps a few straws will show which way the wind is blowing.

On December 19, 1914, I was in Washington and passed the war-referendum idea around among a few members of Congress. On December 29, 1914, Senator Robert L. Owen, of Oklahoma, with whom I had spoken, introduced in the United States senate a resolution proposing that the United States constitution be amended by taking the war-making power from the Congress and depositing it in the people, to be exercised by them only by direct ballot.

The Pennsylvania State Grange and the Farmers' Union of Kansas, according to the public press, en-

dorsed the plan—the first in December and the second in January—and in each case the initiative was taken by the body itself.

The Emergency Peace Conference (non-partizan) which was held in Chicago in February, 1915, according to the public press, demanded that offensive war should be declared only by vote of the people and that the diplomatic function should be democratized. Miss Jane Addams and other non-Socialists of her standing, attended the conference and voted in favor of the war-referendum plan.

Literally hundreds of articles have been written in favor of the plan by persons whom I never saw, since I formulated it in August, 1914.

I have yet to hear of any non-Socialist member of Congress introducing a resolution to establish Socialism, nor have I ever heard of a state grange demanding Socialism. Socialism is the more important, but unfortunately it does not directly appeal to the public mind. I regret the fact, but I am compelled to recognize it.

But I also recognize the fact that war is so horrible that it should be ended at the earliest possible moment. I know of no better way to end war quickly than to enable the public hatred of war to control the war-making power. I believe the loss of the war-making power would greatly cripple capitalism. If so, the seizure by the people of the war-making power would accelerate the departure of capitalism and hasten the coming of Socialism.

Moreover, the more things we put into the Socialist platform that people already know they want, the sooner will they discover that they want and need the rest of the platform.

I am against war and for Socialism—therefore I am for the war-referendum.

CHAPTER IX

WOMEN, WAR AND THE BALLOT

PERHAPS the greatest shock the human race ever received was caused by the breaking out of war in Europe in the summer of 1914. Dull indeed was the mind that could not think in those great days. Some men thought as they had never thought before, and some men thought who had never thought before. In the face of a common danger, men struck out for the truth, regardless of what they had regarded as true the day before. For a few days, the *New York World* boldly advocated an embargo upon the exportation of American food. Others lay stress upon the fact that a few had brought to Europe a war that the millions did not want. It was a time of such earnest thinking as we shall not soon see again.

During this period of tremendous intellectual activity, one clear note was heard again and again—heard in America, heard in Europe, heard everywhere:

Women must have the vote. The war had proved it.

“Something new and helpful must be born in the heart of the world from its long travail in war,” said *The Na-*

tion, of London. "Is it too much to suggest that in such a society the chief argument against the enfranchisement of women must fall to the ground?"

A gentleman who wrote from the Reform Club in London thought it was not too much to hope that the war would give the ballot to women. He had always been opposed to the enfranchisement of anybody but men. In the Liberal Party, he had fought the enfranchisement of women. But in the great tumult of war, he heard a voice he had never heard before—the voice of woman crying for the means with which to protect herself.

The same cry was heard in America. Newspaper after newspaper echoed it. Sometimes it was echoed in an editorial—sometimes in a picture. Wherever it was echoed, the argument and the entreaty were the same. The argument was to this point: Women bear the children and care for them until they are grown. War kills the men outright and drives the women before it as before a prairie fire. What women have borne, women have a right to protect with their ballots.

But is there a person on earth who can demonstrate, by a process of reasoning, that it would have the slightest effect upon war merely to give women the right to vote?

Do not the men of most civilized countries already have the right to vote? If mere voting were, in itself, enough to keep the world from war, why is a world in which men vote still at war? If half of the adult

population, having the right to vote, cannot keep the world from war, why should we expect peace to come merely because the other half are permitted to do what the first half have so long done ineffectively?

Women should understand, as men should understand, that the right to vote amounts, in itself, to little. What women and men most need is the right to vote directly and determinatively upon the things that most vitally concern them. To this day, men have not gained the right to vote directly upon many things that much concern them. That is why the ballot, even in man's hands, has thus far amounted to so little. We vote not upon a question, but upon a man. We do so, not because it is the right way to do, but because it is the wrong way to do. If it had been the right way to do, the ruling class would have provided some other way. The men who have the power to surrender under fire, surrender only as little as they must. The history of the enfranchisement of men is but the story of the miserly manner in which the ruling class, under stress of necessity, has abdicated its power. First, the demand for the ballot was denied and resented upon the ground that it was not the province of common people to govern; then, in the face of a renewed, an insistent and an ominous demand for the ballot, the form, but not the substance, was given to men only.

When women first demanded the ballot, they were rebuffed by all men as common men had themselves been rebuffed by their masters. The common men, in their selfishness and littleness, also clutched at what

they believed was their power but which, in reality, was but the shadow of power. The common men of the world are now shedding their selfishness and voting to let women share with them the shadow of power, but neither the men nor the women realize that it is but a shadow that they are to share.

What reality is there in the political power that we men have in this country—so far as war is concerned? I center the question upon war, not because it does not equally apply to every other act of government, but because the relationship of woman to the ballot and to war is the subject under consideration.

What reality is there in the political power that we men possess? Just this much and no more: By a more or less circuitous route, we men are able to reason that our votes set into action a certain train of events. We may not like the train of events—we often do not. But if the Secretary of State, by stupidity or design, should so handle our diplomatic affairs that we should become involved in war, we should be able to say that we elected delegates to a national convention who, for reasons best known to themselves, nominated for the Presidency a certain man, and that he, when he became President, for reasons best known to himself, nominated and, with the consent of the Senate, appointed the Secretary of State.

We men, though we have the ballot, have no more to do with the question of whether this nation shall or

shall not make war upon another than have the women of the country who have no ballot.

The war-making power in this nation is held by fewer than 600 men, and it is possible to declare war at the will of only 135 men. I am a man and I have the ballot, but in the matter of war, my ballot gives me no power that is not possessed by an immigrant woman tripping down the gangplank of a steamship with a bundle of clothing balanced upon her head. Yet men say and women say that the Great War in Europe demonstrates the need of women for the ballot that men already have.

It would be fortunate indeed if war could be so easily ended. It would be fortunate indeed if the possession, by women, of the mere right to vote, could reasonably be expected to have an adverse effect upon war. But have we justification for indulging such expectation? I contend that we have not.

It was not necessary to have the Great War in Europe to prove that women have a right to vote. As human beings, women had, when they were born, all of the inherent rights of men. What the Great War in Europe proved beyond a doubt was that both men and women needed something more than the ballot. Both need not only the power to vote, but the power to vote upon subjects worth while. War is such a subject.

No argument was ever made against woman suffrage that could not have been made with as much force against men. The strongest male advocates of

woman suffrage, however, have always recognized the fact that the mere enfranchisement of women would not much alter matters, and in some respects might make them worse. Women, as a class, are even less informed than men concerning public affairs, and are perhaps more inclined to carry caution to the point of timidity. Excess of caution is not favorable to the uprooting of wrong and the establishment of right.

But every argument that has ever been made against woman suffrage falls flat when it is applied to the demand that both women and men shall have the power to vote on war. Anyone can say that women do not understand the tariff question, or the currency question, but no one can prove that women do not know whether they want war. Women know what war means and, without a moment's preparation, they are perfectly equipped to say whether they wish to exchange peace for war. Women might have to spend a lifetime to master the tariff, but they would not have to spend a day to master war.

Nor would the excessive caution of women (if it be true that women are excessively cautious) constitute a handicap upon progress if women were given the power to vote on war. On the contrary, the greater conservatism of women would prove an asset rather than a liability.

Woman, armed the world over with half of the war-making power, would instantly become a political factor of the first importance. With half of the war-making power in the hands of women, eternal peace

would have come to the world. It is inconceivable that more than a handful of women would ever vote to deluge the earth with blood.

If it be conceded that women, as a class, would everywhere and always vote almost solidly against war, we are brought back to the questions from which we started. "Do the human beings who inhabit the earth really want to end war?" Do the common people fight because they like to or because they have to? If the common people are opposed to war, why should they not seize the war-making power and divide it equally among the sexes?

This is the point at which we must test our professed desire for peace. If we cannot stand this test, we do not really want peace. The energetic women of the land are eager for the ballot. The enlightened men of the land are eager to give the ballot to women. Socialists, in particular, are insistent in their demand that women shall be enfranchised. Let all such persons answer this question: "If you are so eager that women shall vote on subjects that perhaps they do not understand, why not demand for them the power to vote on a subject they do understand—war?"

It is easy enough to say that so long as the capitalist system of industry is in existence, it will not be worth while to demand such power from government, which the owners of industry always control.

The reply to such criticism is that the duration of the capitalist régime is largely dependent upon the

number of persons who become dissatisfied with it because of its refusal to meet their just demands.

Let five million women and five million men begin to clamor for the war-making power, and your government at Washington, though it may not instantly yield to the clamor, will accord it most earnest and respectful attention. Ten millions of American citizens are not to be ignored by any government. No President ever had ten million votes. Yet five million men and five million women would constitute but a quarter of the adult population of the United States. If a quarter of the adult population were insufficient to move the Government, another ten million could hardly fail to compel obedience from the strongest capitalist administration. It is unsafe long to resist any demand made by half of the people, because to resist is to invite revolution. When half of the people unite upon any demand, public sentiment is overwhelmingly in their favor, because part of the remaining half may be depended upon to be indifferent.

Women who are leading the fight for equal suffrage will be blind indeed if they do not also demand the legal right of both men and women to vote on war. No argument could be made that would appeal more powerfully to men. Common men everywhere are heartily sick of war and wish to end it forever. Show such men that if both men and women had the power to vote on war there would be no more war and men would be instantly supplied with a reason they never had for giving the ballot to women. If women will

say to men: "Give us, not only the ballot, but the war-ballot, and we will promise to cast it with you against war," men will be interested in giving the vote to women.

The desire to do justice to others is perhaps the last motive by which most human beings are moved. The general tendency is to hope that all persons may have justice—and leave them to get it themselves as best they may. Yet, up to this time, the campaign for equal suffrage has been wholly based upon the argument that men, if they wish to be just, must give the ballot to women. No man has ever been made to feel for a moment that his personal welfare would be, in the slightest degree, safeguarded by giving women the right to vote.

Since man (like woman) is selfish, why not utilize his selfishness? Why fight for equal suffrage in the hardest way? Why demand justice for yourselves when you can as well also promise protection to men? In the matter of war, women can promise protection to men and men will believe them. Women cannot say to men (and be believed): "If you will only permit us to vote, we will settle the tariff question for you much better than you have ever been able to settle it for yourselves." Men would laugh at such promises, even if women were foolish enough to make them. But women would be believed if they were to say to men: "Give us not only the power to vote, but the power to vote on war; also take such power yourselves, and together we will use it to keep peace." Men

would believe such a promise and be moved by such an argument, because the promise is in harmony with what men know of women and the argument is addressed both to men's fears and their needs. Men fear war and need peace. Men know women abhor war. No man could be convinced that the women of this country would ever vote to convert the United States into a slaughter house. If men doubted the ability of women to vote wisely upon any other subject, they would still trust women to vote against war.

Have women less confidence in themselves than men have in them? Do the leaders of the equal suffrage movement doubt that if women were empowered to vote on war they would vote almost solidly against it? Is there a single woman suffrage leader in the world who doubts the ability of women, as a class, to vote wisely on the question of war?

If peace is important and women, like men, are opposed to war, why is it not vital that the war-making power shall be vested in those who may be depended upon not to use it? If women believe they have the ability to vote wisely upon war, why should they content themselves with a mere ballot? A woman who would admit that she could not vote wisely as to war would have difficulty in convincing most men that she could vote wisely upon anything. A woman who would declare peace to be preferable to war would convince most men that she understood something about war, even if they believed she understood nothing about anything else.

Woman's right to equal suffrage cannot in justice be disputed.

Woman's ability much to improve conditions, if given the ballot, can be questioned.

But the probability that women, if given the power, would vote overwhelmingly against war, approximates a certainty.

Which is the stronger plea to make to selfish men—that women should have justice, or that both men and women should be, and voting together can be, spared from the horrors of war? I trust that I have made this point so plain that suffrage leaders will not overlook it.

I have here suggested that women be given a great power. Power should always be accompanied by corresponding responsibility. I have ventured, however, to depart somewhat, in this instance, from a correct principle. If woman's power to vote on war were to be balanced with responsibility equal to the power, each woman who might vote for war would, in the event of war, be compelled, like men, to take her place in the ranks as a soldier.

I have suggested that departure be made from a correct principle to the extent of sparing from military service every woman who might vote for war unless the votes of men, without the votes of women, would have been insufficient to create war. I have suggested that women be compelled to serve as soldiers only in the event that their votes should turn the scale toward war, while adding that no woman who

might vote against war should, in any circumstances, be compelled to serve.

These suggestions depart, in two particulars, from the program suggested for men. Any man who might vote for war might be compelled to serve in the event of war, and any man who might vote against war might be compelled to serve if the war-makers should be unequal to the task of defeating the enemy. I have suggested the exceptions in favor of women because the thought of women on the battlefield is abhorrent to me. I have suggested that women who might vote for war should, in some circumstances, be compelled to serve, because the thought of men on the battlefield is abhorrent to me.

The suggestion that women, in any circumstances, should serve as soldiers is probably superfluous. It is made more as a matter of principle than anything else. I still contend, however, that if there be 10,000 women in America who would join a minority of men in bringing about war they should be sent to the front and compelled to take their chances.

The point is not worth pressing, however, because it is a practical certainty that if men and women were to seize the war-making power in America, the women would outdo even the men in voting against war.

At this place, a practical question arises. If the people of the United States were to democratize their war-making power and their diplomacy, would war be forever banished from the United States?

Not necessarily. No plan, if adopted by a single

nation, would be sufficient to insure that nation against war. Socialism, if adopted by the United States alone, would be by no means sufficient to bring eternal peace, nor should we have such peace if we were all Quakers. Neither Socialism nor the hatred of war that is in Quakers would insure peace, because we should be in danger of attack so long as other peoples left their war-making powers in the hands of minorities. No legislation that we can enact can prevent minorities who have the power from attacking us. The most we can do is to prevent any minority in this country from attacking any other nation. Every time we prevent a minority in this country from attacking another nation, we spare two peoples from the horrors of war—ourselves and those who would have been our victims.

It is my contention that the adoption of the policies here advocated would immediately banish from the United States all wars except such as minorities in other nations might force upon us, and that the adoption of the policies throughout the world would banish war from the world.

If the people throughout the world are opposed to war, they would not, if they had the power, vote to begin war.

If the people of no nation would vote for wars of aggression, no people would be compelled to wage wars of defense. When aggression ceases, the necessity for defense will also cease.

To contend that the absorption by the people, the

world over, of the war-making power, and the control by the people of diplomacy would not end war is to contend that the people want war, and that the minorities who make war are only giving the people what they want.

This contention is so absurd that the mere statement of it is enough to show its falsity.

CHAPTER X

THE CAUSES OF MODERN WAR

MODERN war is caused by the laws that give a few men the power to own the earth and govern everybody on it. In each nation is a great working class and a small owning class. The interests of these classes are fundamentally antagonistic. We who live upon and do the work of this earth are little more than the customers of those who own it. We buy from them the privilege of living. We are their assets and they are our liabilities. If it were not for us, they would have no customers. If it were not for them, we should have no masters; we could use the earth without paying anybody for the privilege, and we could consume what we had made without paying anybody a profit.

The best of corner grocers sometimes fall out because one gets a customer away from the other. The worst of owning classes sometimes fall out because one outstrips the other in the race for foreign trade. Owning classes, upon such occasions, cannot be friendly. Owning classes exist only for the purpose of obtaining profits, and profits cannot be obtained without foreign, as well as domestic, trade. Domestic trade is not, in itself, enough. It is not enough be-

cause the working class of a nation can buy back no more of the goods it has made than it can pay for with its wages. If the wages of the workers were enough to enable them to buy back all the goods they had made, there would be no profits for the owning class and therefore no incentive for ownership. Wages must therefore always be less than the value of the product, and the goods that the domestic working class cannot buy must be sold abroad or devoted to the extension of domestic industries.

However absurd it may be for the owning class of each nation to try to produce more goods than can be sold at home and to try to sell the surplus to foreign workers who are too poor to buy all of their own product—however absurd this plan may be, it is the plan upon which the world is run, and it is the great cause of war. The ruling classes of Great Britain and Germany hate each other because they are bitter rivals for foreign markets. The United States of America has hardly a friend among the nations of the earth for no other reason than the fact that the owning class of America is aggressively in pursuit of foreign trade.

The great cause of modern war is therefore the ownership by a few—and for private profit—of the industrial machinery with which we supply our needs. If goods were produced for use and not for profit, and were exchanged for convenience rather than for profit, nobody in Germany would care how much hardware Great Britain might ship to China and nobody in Great

Britain would care how much cloth Germany might ship to South America. But so long as the people of the earth remain mere customers of the owning classes, we may expect the owning classes to wish to fight to hold them. It is no more certainly true that it is the attractive power of the earth that brings the rain from the clouds than it is true that it is the private ownership of industry that causes war. But an effect can sometimes be avoided before the cause can be removed. The building of a roof repeals the law of gravitation, so far as the man who is sheltered from the rain is concerned. To strip the owning class of the war-making power would leave the world at peace though the private ownership of industry still gave the owning class the desire for war.

Each nation is governed by representatives of its owning class. By this is meant that each nation is governed by a man or by men who represent the views of its owning class with regard to the ownership of property. The views of the Czar of Russia are in harmony with the views of the Grand Dukes and other landed aristocrats. The President and the Congress of the United States may and sometimes do differ from great capitalists as to details, but the Government at Washington is always in harmony with the great capitalists in the contention that the great industries of this country should be privately owned for private profit. The owning class of each nation always takes care to control the Government. Such control is necessary to the permanence of the owning class.

Without such control, the owning class would soon cease to own.

The interests, aims and purposes of the owning class are antagonistic to the interests, aims and purposes of the working class. The owning class control government, therefore government is administered, in the main, in the interest of the owning class. If government were not so administered, we should not have war. The diplomacy of the world is but little more than the story of the efforts of owning classes to rob each other, and the greatest tragedies of history are the wars fought by simple peasants and factory workers to settle questions that concerned them not at all. Of what possible advantage has it been, for instance, to the peasants of Russia, that the Baltic coast is controlled by the Russian Government? Yet to gain this control cost the lives of seven hundred thousand Russian workingmen, according to Professor Usher in his book entitled "*Pan-Germanism.*" Moreover, he says, "her territory on the Black Sea coast cost the same."

Fourteen hundred thousand lives snuffed out—for what? Dare anyone say that the plight of the Russian peasant, miserable as it is, would have been worse if the flag of the Czar had not been pushed to the shores of the Black and the Baltic Seas? The owning class of Russia murdered more than a million Russian men to push the flag along. Probably as many men died in opposing armies to keep the Russian flag back.

None would have died if only the interests of the people had been consulted.

But Russia, it may be explained, wanted to expand. How deftly do ruling classes try to make their purposes seem to be our purposes. What do we mean by "Russia"? What do we mean by "expand"? Do we mean that the people of Russia were crowded and wanted more land upon which to live? Do we mean that millions were willing to die to get more land for those who might survive? How can we mean either of these things? Do we not know that when the Russian people—or any other people—wish to live elsewhere, they have but to board a train or a steamship and depart? Is it not one of the commonest sights of life to see part of the people of a nation "expanding" by steamship or railway? The people, when left to themselves, never insist upon carrying the frontiers of their country along with them. More than a million Europeans come to the United States every year, yet not one of them has ever tried to induce his native country to annex the United States. Thousands of American farmers annually emigrate to British Columbia. The crossing of the frontier by these Americans brings no shock to either country. But there would long ago have been war between the United States and Great Britain if the United States had attempted to convert the peaceful expansion of population by passenger train into forcible extension of national boundaries.

The cry of expansion is heard around the world. We are told that growing peoples must have room.

No more fraudulent cry was ever raised. It is the cry of ruling classes bent upon holding the power they have or gaining more. What do ruling classes care for people, except as customers and soldiers? Do they care anything? If they care anything, why do not they cease robbing the people in times of peace and driving them forth to war to be slain? Yet the ruling class of a nation that is losing millions of its domestic customers by emigration invariably draws a long face and urges expansion of national boundaries by force of arms.

The reason therefor is simple. Every citizen is a potential soldier. Every soldier is power personified. Ruling classes depend upon power for their existence. A nation that has lost 10,000,000 men, women and children by emigration has lost the equivalent of a mighty army today and a mightier army tomorrow. From a military point of view, Germany would be vastly more powerful today if she had the 10,000,000 Germans who have emigrated to the United States. If it were not for the military power of these departed Germans, the ruling class of Germany would not have the slightest interest in their whereabouts, or the slightest desire for expansion. Rich Germans care nothing for poor Germans except as customers and soldiers, precisely as rich Americans care nothing for poor Americans except as customers and soldiers.

The antagonisms between working class interests and owning class interests are so plain that, in the matter of war, it is almost impossible to overlook them.

Mr. G. Lowes Dickinson, an English publicist, contributed to the December, 1914, number of the *Atlantic Monthly* an article in which he analyzed some of the causes of war with remarkable clearness. He flatly attributed war to the class that controls government. He called this class the "governing" class, and nowhere intimated that he also perceived the governing class to be the representative of the class that owns the world's industries.

Writing of the Great War in Europe, Mr. Dickinson said:

"I believe that this war, like all wars for many centuries in Europe, was brought about by governments, without the connivance and against the desires and the interests of peoples; that it is a calamity to civilization unequalled, unexampled, perhaps irremediable; and that the only good that can come out of it is a clearer comprehension by ordinary men and women of how wars are brought about, and a determination on their part to put a stop to them.

"The millions who are carrying on the war, at the cost of incalculable suffering, would never have made it if the decision had rested with them. That is the one indisputable fact."

Why, then, would it not have been better if the decision had rested with the people?

Mr. Dickinson next proceeds to inquire how governments force unwilling peoples to war:

"The immediate answer is simple enough. In no country is there any effective control by the people over foreign policy. . . . The foreign offices and the press do with nations what they like."

Why would it not be better for the people to do with foreign policies and the press what they like?

Mr. Dickinson attributes war to the fact that states are governed by "governing classes" who regard nations as natural enemies, since the welfare of each demands that it expand at the expense of some other. "The world," he says, "is being controlled by men who are the victims of sheer illusion; whether it be defect of mind, of heart or of soul that has fastened the illusion upon them" Mr. Dickinson does not pretend to know.

Whether the ruling class is insane, degenerate or merely representing the interests of business is not the fact of chief importance. The fact of chief importance is that war persists in a world that is tired of war because the war-making power is held by a class who use it against the wishes of the people. Mr. Dickinson may or may not believe the ruling class is insane, or degenerate. If the rulers of the earth are insane, they are perhaps the most successful lunatics who have ever been born. If fifty lunatics can hurl 400,000,000 sane people into war, there would seem to be no advantage in being sane. The ruling class never go hungry. The working class are always on the brink of hunger. Unless we wish to proceed upon the assumption that sanity is a handicap and lunacy an accomplishment, we might as well open our eyes to the simple fact that the owners of this earth are merely trying to govern it in their own interests, rather than in the interests of the people. The owners of the

earth would prefer to accomplish their desires, if they could, without war, but they prefer war to the abandonment of their desires.

Many of our inherited opinions help the owning class to rob us in peace and kill us in war. We have inherited the opinion that the earth should be divided into nations and that each nation should enrich itself at the expense of some other or of all other nations. The first flaw in this opinion is the belief that to gain trade for an owning class is not to gain wealth for the working class. We may ship great quantities of cotton goods to China, yet the American cotton mill operative never receives more than a bare living. The second flaw lies in the idea of nationality itself. The more nations there are in the world—at least under owning class rule—the greater the probability of trouble. We Americans have derived untold blessings from the fact that our territory is under one general government. If continental United States were carved into six nations, each of them would be compelled to arm against the others as each nation of Europe is compelled to arm against the others. We keep the peace from the Atlantic to the Pacific, except for industrial wars, because no part of our population is compelled to arm against any other part, and the Government at Washington prevents one state from closing its ports to another or erecting tariff barriers.

What we have gained from being a single nation, the world would gain if it were a single nation. The existing nations should be self-governing units so far

as local affairs are concerned, precisely as our states are self-governing units, but a congress sitting in Washington, London or Bombay, and composed of representatives from all of the units, should be the supreme governing power. Such a congress would not have much to do. Most of the questions that concern us are local. If the earth and its industries belonged to the people collectively, precisely as the postal system belongs to us collectively, a world congress would have little to do but lay down general principles. Governments now chiefly concern themselves with war preparations, war operations and contests for trade. If the profit system, with its owning class, were discarded, and national boundaries were obliterated, none of the acts with which governments now chiefly concern themselves would be necessary.

All of the causes of war may be crammed into the single statement that war comes as the result of the neglect of the people to own their earth and rule themselves.

So long as the earth is parceled out among owning classes who rule the people on it, so long will the owning classes quarrel among themselves as to which shall have us for their customers, and so long will the disputants occasionally wish to set us to fighting to settle their quarrels.

No necessity can be cited for the situation that exists. The people do not need an owning class to own the earth and rule them. The fact that such an owning class exists is a colossal calamity. That class breeds

poverty in peace and death in war. The people of the United States run all of the trains and factories in the United States. It is no advantage whatever to the people that these industries are owned by a few idlers. The people are as well able to own the industries as they are to own the capitol at Washington. Nobody has ever questioned the ability of the people to own, collectively, great machines for the killing of men. Why cannot the people as well own great machines to feed and clothe men and women? If it be proper for the people to own the means of taking life, why is it not proper for the people to own the means with which to make life worth while? Since the existence of small, wrangling owning classes is the cause of both war and poverty, why not end both war and poverty by ending the owning classes? In the meantime, why not wrench the dagger from the hand of Greed by depriving the owning classes, the world over, of the power to declare war? Who except the owning classes would thereby be weakened? Owning classes have no power except that which they derive from laws backed by the force of their victims' bodies. Why not take from the owning class of the United States the law with which they declare war?

What might we reasonably expect would be the effect upon the working classes of other nations if the word should go around the world that the working class of the United States had made it impossible for anybody except themselves to declare aggressive war? What would be the effect upon war-worn peoples, the

world around, if they should discover that the people of the United States were firmly resolved to begin no war upon another nation? How long would it be before the people of other nations, already tired of war, would say: "We, too, are weary of being driven away to wars we do not want. We, too, demand that our rulers shall surrender to us the power to declare war."

CHAPTER XI

PATRIOTISM

WE should have war until the crack of doom if the people were never to change their ideas about the things that make war. If we want war forever, all we have to do is to sit back and say: "We are right today. We were right yesterday. We have always been right, and we will never acknowledge we have been wrong about anything."

Nobody would be so foolish as to make such statements. Everybody is willing to admit, in a general way, that the whole world has much to learn. Yet, when you pin a man down to a particular thing and ask: "Are you not wrong about this?" the chances are that he will prepare to back up his old beliefs. This is particularly true of any belief that has come down through the centuries.

One of our oldest beliefs has to do with patriotism. There is an old saying: "My country, may it ever be right, but right or wrong, my country." Anyone who can say that and feel it is regarded as grandly patriotic.

People who believe in patriotism do not understand what patriotism is, or what it leads to. If they did, they would revise their definition of patriotism, or

cease to be patriotic. As honest men and women, they would be compelled to do so because the kind of patriotism they believe in leads to war. Without such patriotism, there could not be war in Europe today.

What does patriotism mean to the average man? Ask the average man and he will say, "Patriotism means love of one's country."

Now, with all respect to those who regard patriotism as a virtue, this is nonsense. What does the patriot mean when he says he loves his country? He cannot mean that he loves the ground that lies within the nation's boundaries. What does he mean? Does he mean that he loves the country's laws and its government? He certainly does not. If such were the definition of patriotism there would be almost no patriots in the country, because nobody is satisfied with the laws and almost everybody has a feeling that the Government does not deal out even-handed justice as between rich and poor.

Does the patriot, then, mean that he loves the people of his country? That is the only sort of patriotism that would be worth having. Nothing could be more splendid than for human beings to regard each other as brothers and sisters and to treat each other with consideration and feel for each other affection. But does the patriot love his country in this sense? He certainly does not. In this sense, almost nobody loves his country. We do not live in a world that permits anybody to have much good feeling for anybody else. The struggle for existence is too hard. In order to

keep alive, everybody has to be pretty much for himself. Moreover, we get in each other's way. We are all after an opportunity to work and live in comfort and there are not enough opportunities for everybody. There might be enough, but there are not enough. So, instead of going about it in an intelligent manner to increase the opportunities—which we might easily do—we shoulder each other out of the way if we can and feel toward each other a brotherly feeling of considerable chilliness.

Furthermore, why should anybody have more love for the people of his own country than he has for the people of any other country? If we poor human beings are anything, are we not brothers all the world around? Does anyone of sense believe there is much difference in the inherent goodness of civilized human beings? Are we so ignorantly conceited that we believe we are better than Englishmen, Germans or Frenchmen? Certainly the people of each country cannot be better than the people of every other country. If the people of some country are better than the people of any other country, the people of every other country must be inferior. Yet what people regard themselves as inferiors? No people. Patriotism causes the people of each country to believe they are the best people in the world.

But patriotism does more than that. Patriotism, on the surface, is the measure of our love for ourselves, but beneath the surface it is the measure of our hatred of others. In times of peace, this hatred slumbers.

But no matter how much our hatred of others may slumber, it never dies. It is always there, ready to spring up like a tiger when poked by circumstances. Unscrupulous men know how to control the circumstances that stir our hatred of others. Print a few lies in the newspapers; represent the people whom they want us to murder as scoundrels and the deed is done. We immediately become patriotic and go forth to kill.

That is what has been done in Europe. England and Germany have been lying about each other for years. France and Germany have been lying about each other for years. Germany and Russia have been lying about each other for years. I mean, of course, that the ruling classes of these countries have been lying about the people of the other countries. No matter what anyone may say, accept this much as true: The people of none of these countries are bad. They are precisely as good as any other people. If they were left to themselves, they would not fight. If they were not lied to, they would not fight. If they were not "patriotic" they would not believe the lies. If I were patriotic, I could not believe that the people of any other country are as good as I am, and as we are. It is only because I am not patriotic that I know I am no better and we are no better than others.

Patriotism is a delusion and a danger. The word should have no place in our dictionary, and the thought should have no place in our minds. If we consider patriotism in its best sense—merely as love

for the people of one's country—it is stupid because there is no reason why we should single out our own people above any others; we should have a kindly feeling toward human beings everywhere. If we consider it as the expression of our feeling of superiority over others, it is also stupid, and if we consider it is the measure of our smoldering power to hate—then it is a crime.

It is because the people of Europe are patriotic and, therefore, have the power to hate that they are fighting. And, at that, they do not know what they are fighting. The Germans will tell you they are fighting "England," for instance. "England," just now, stands for a thing that Germans hate. This thing that Germans hate is really nothing but the attitude of a few Englishmen toward the Germans. In other words, the thing that Germans hate is the British policy toward the German people. But the British people have no more to do with determining the British policy toward Germany than the German people have to do with determining the German attitude toward the British people. The ruling class of each country determines what the attitude of the country shall be toward all other countries. Yet the German people are not killing the men who have made the policy they hate, nor are the English killing the men who have made the German policy they hate. If they were, there might be some sense in this war.

The German and the English soldiers who are killing each other are killing men who have absolutely

nothing to do with the creation of the policies that they hate.

They are cutting each other's throats merely because, being patriotic, they have been taught to be pompous, proud and full of venom. Otherwise, the Germans would have said to their ruling class:

"We are not going to kill the common people of England merely because we do not like the things their rulers have done. We like the English people. We do not believe the bad stories that you tell us about them. We do not like the policy of the British ruling class toward Germans and, if you want to make war on the British ruling class in person, we might consider it. But kill the British people—no."

Without patriotism, the English would have made the same reply to their ruling class. In fact, the gentlemen who rule these two nations might not have been able to have a war unless they fought it themselves, which we may depend upon it they would not have done.

Workingmen would never think of giving up their lives for their ruling classes if they knew what they were doing. Patriotism makes them believe they are fighting for their country. Think of an Englishman without house or home, money or a job, fighting for his country! Or a German, a Frenchman—or an American. It is perfectly legitimate for a man to resist invasion on the ground that however poor he may be, he has a right to remain undisturbed; but to call that fighting for his country is somewhat ex-

ceeding the limit. But the ruling class is compelled to glorify the killing business and make it seem something it is not in order to induce people to engage in it. The best thing that any man can do for his country is to keep alive, mind his business, keep at work and be decent to those about him.

The audacity of the ruling classes in this matter is almost enough to burst the brain of a workingman who understands it. Think of these poor soldiers in Europe who are not only giving up their lives but enduring untold hardships "for their respective countries." If there were any decency in the ruling classes that they are in fact serving, the survivors, for the remainder of their lives, would be all but smothered with every sort of evidence of ruling class gratitude. Nothing in France would be too good for the French soldier after the war is over. In all the countries at war (if there were any such thing as ruling class gratitude) laws would be revised to give the common people who did the fighting a fair chance for existence.

Let us consider what these poor soldiers are doing for their respective ruling classes in order that you may the better judge whether they are entitled to any gratitude. A correspondent was describing life in the trenches. He said the rain of bursting shells was so severe that it became necessary to cover the trenches with timber and pile earth upon it. Under these "bombproofs" the men huddle. The tremendous thunder of the artillery and the shrieking of shells is

terrifying. But so long as the enemy's artillery is in action, the men in the trenches can only hide and wait. But, at a word of command from their officers they must leap out of the trenches, face this hell of fire, and endeavor to shoot down the enemy's infantry when it advances under cover of the artillery.

Where do men get the courage to do such things? What hearts they must have to be able to climb out of the trenches and plunge into such a holocaust of death.

And it is this sort of service that the common people of Europe are performing for their respective ruling classes.

If the ruling classes really appreciated such services do you believe it would be too much if they would say to the working classes, after the war is over:

"You have made good with us. You have gone into hell's mouth to save us and our property and we hereby serve notice that we are going to get off your backs at once and keep off. We take off our hats to you. From now on, the most we will ask is a chance to take our places beside you, work as you work and live as you live."

But no such speech will anywhere be made. The British worker will go back to his little old London slums, or to his underpaid place in a factory. The French and Russian peasants will go back to their hard lives and the German soldier will go into the army of unemployed and try to find a job.

Fighting and dying for one's country mean fighting

and dying for the ruling class of one's country. To be patriotic in wartime means to hate the ruling class and kill the working class of the country which your own rulers want you to fight. And mind you, your own rulers have nothing against the people whom they want you to kill. Your own rulers want these people killed only because they have become the dupes of the ruling class which your own ruling class wants, perhaps, to rob.

Old Samuel Johnson used to say that "Patriotism is the last refuge of the scoundrel." I doubt if this is correct. It is one of the first refuges. About the first thing the child at school is taught is to salute the flag and be patriotic.

So far as the stars and stripes may be said to symbolize the sovereignty of the people of the United States, our flag is a grand and noble symbol.

So far as our flag symbolizes love for each other and love of liberty and justice, it is a glorious symbol.

But to the extent that our flag stands for the criminal, fraudulent sentiment that fills us, first with swaggering self-conceit and, next, with contempt for or hatred of others—to that extent, our flag is a fraud.

But the flag, it should always be remembered, is only what it means to each of us. If the flag made me feel patriotic, I should hate it. I look upon the flag as the outward symbol of a great people's hopes for life, liberty and happiness on this earth and in this place. It is because I love the flag I see that I so often regret the base uses to which it is put.

CHAPTER XII

TO CHRISTIANS WHO PRAY FOR PEACE

WHO loves peace? Christians love peace. Who are Christians? The Czar of Russia is a Christian. The French President is a Christian. The King of England is a Christian. The Emperor of Austria-Hungary is a Christian. The King of Belgium is a Christian. The King of Servia is a Christian. And the United States is a Christian nation.

What are Christians doing to bring peace back to the world and hold it? The Czar of Russia is pouring millions of troops into Germany and Austria-Hungary. The German Emperor is shaking the heavens over France with his mighty siege guns. The French President is hurling at Germany such armies as Napoleon never saw. The British King has stationed in the North Sea the greatest fleet that ever went forth to battle. The British King has a million men in France—to fight Germany. The Emperor of Austria-Hungary is bringing to bear upon Russia, France and Great Britain every gun and every man he can muster. The King of Belgium, “with bloody hands, is welcoming Germans to hospitable graves.” The King of Servia is killing every Austro-Hungarian whom he can reach. And the peo-

ple of the United States, on Sunday, October 4, 1914, at the request of President Wilson, went forth to pray.

Good Christian people of the United States, you never seemed so admirable as you do now. Your eyes are wet with tears, but your hands are not wet with blood. Your own troubles are many, but they have not made you forget the greater troubles of others. They pray to the God of Battle. You pray to the God of Peace. May you be heard.

But what if you should be heard? What if your God should ask you questions? What if your God should say: "You ask me to bring peace to Europe. What have you done to keep peace in the United States? The United States may be at war next. I note that it has a large navy, and I have observed that its government occasionally has a meddling disposition. If the United States should be at war next, whose fault would it be? Would it be your fault or the fault of your rulers? Would you declare war, or would a few men declare war for you? If a few men should declare war for you, do you believe I should hold you blameless? Did I say 'Thou shalt not kill,' or did I say 'Thou shalt not kill unless others shall tell thee to do so—and then thou shalt kill by hundreds'? Did I say you were all my children and all brothers to each other, or did I say that some were my children and others were not? Did I tell you to love yourselves or to love your neighbors as yourselves?"

Good Christian people of the United States, let us answer these questions by talking about prayer. And, since the great nations of Europe are at war, let us search our hearts by considering what some of the great men of the nations at war have said about prayer.

In Russia is a proverb so old that no man may say how old it is. That proverb runs as follows:

"What men usually ask for, when they pray to God, is that two and two may not make four."

Gentle Christians—followers of the Prince of Peace—are you not asking that two and two shall not make four in Europe? Are you not asking that two and two shall not make four in the United States? The people of Europe had little or nothing to do with the bringing about of the present slaughter because they had foolishly permitted a few men to hold the war-making power. The Kaiser sent Germany to war. The Czar sent Russia to war. Francis Joseph sent Austria-Hungary to war. A handful of men in the French parliament sent France to war. A handful of men in the British parliament sent Great Britain to war. Nowhere were the people consulted, either at the moment of war-making or before the war. Kings made treaties as they pleased, though the treaties were sputtering fuses leading to powder chambers in the hearts of their respective subjects.

Wherein is the situation in the United States much different? Our constitution declares that Congress shall have the power to declare war. Congress is com-

posed of 531 members. A quorum is 266 members. A majority of a quorum can declare war and 134 members are a majority of a quorum. Add the President and we have 135 men as the number necessary to hurl 100,000,000 people into war.

Suppose 135 men should hurl us into war and you should go to God and pray for peace. If you had not fought to obtain for everybody the right to vote upon the war declaration, do you believe your God would say: "You are a good man. You deserve peace. I'll end the war." Or is it possible that your God would say: "When you have peace why don't you protect it? Why do you permit a few men to speak for you and all the other millions? Why do you not speak for yourselves? Have I ever said that I did not hold each of you responsible for the observance of my commandment not to kill? Have I ever said that if 135 should vote to kill I would pardon the other 100,000,000 for killing?"

Europe is cursed with secret diplomacy. Secret diplomacy helped to bring about the present war. How much better is our diplomacy? It is not as bad as European diplomacy, but how far short is it from what it should be? How much do the people have to do with shaping it? The United States, in 1914, by the narrowest of margins escaped a war with Mexico in which tens of thousands of Americans and Mexicans would have been killed.

If such a war had come and you had gone to God to pray for peace, what do you believe God would

have said? Do you believe He would have said: "Don't worry about those miserable Mexicans. They are not my children—they are dogs. Kill all you want to of them. Your President is quite right in slaying them. You are quite right in permitting your President to begin slaying them without consulting you." Or do you suspect that God might have said something else? Is it possible that He might have said: "It is useless to beseech me to make two and two anything but four. If you do not like the result you would do well to cease creating the causes."

Martin Luther, speaking from the Germany of long ago, said: "*The fewer words, the better prayer.*"

In how many words do you pray for peace in Europe? Do you use one of the prepared prayers furnished by New York pastors who employ from 500 to 800 words in which to frame their supplications? Why not be Luther-like and put it all into a single sentence:

"Almighty God, give us the courage to resist our rulers and say that we will not go to war unless we ourselves have voted for it and are willing to go before you with bloody hands and try to justify our conduct."

Jeremy Taylor, speaking from the England of olden times, said: "*Whatsoever we beg of God, let us also work for it.*" You pray for peace in Europe. You long for continued peace in the United States. How much have you done and are you doing to insure continued peace in the United States? Do you

hold any part of the power to declare war? Do you believe you have no responsibility for making certain that war shall not come? If you have failed to fight for the right to vote against war do you believe God would acquit you of responsibility for a war that you had done nothing to prevent? Do you believe there are not crimes of omission as well as of commission?

Victor Hugo said: "*Certain thoughts are prayers. There are moments when, whatever be the attitude of the body, the soul is on its knees.*"

Good Christian people of the United States—we Socialists are accused by grafters of almost every crime in the calendar. We should be surprised if we were not accused by grafters of almost every crime in the calendar. We are after the grafters. We are trying to put the grafters out of business. The grafters desire to remain in business. They therefore attack us. Among other things they say of us that we are a wicked, irreligious people.

I do not know what the grafters may mean by "irreligious." I do not much care. I have no great respect for a grafter's conception of religion. But this much I know to be true: If "certain thoughts are prayers," Socialists are praying all the while. If "there are moments when, whatever be the attitude of the body, the soul is on its knees," the souls of Socialists are always on their knees. Socialists are praying all the while in the sense that they are trying to add their little mite toward making this a kinder, better world. The souls of Socialists are always on

their knees in the sense that they are constantly pleading with you, and all other well-disposed men and women, to help them make this a kinder, better world.

Christian men and women of the United States: It is useless to shuffle facts or mince words. Either war is right or it is wrong. Either the Savior said: "Thou shalt not kill," or He didn't. If He said "Thou shalt not kill" presumably He meant precisely what He said. If He meant precisely what He said, war is wrong. If war is wrong, each of us has an individual responsibility for war.

It is not enough to cry peace when there is no peace. It is not enough to oppose war without taking adequate measures to prevent a few from precipitating us into war. We shall have wars until the crack of doom if we permit small ruling classes, having the war-making power, to control the governments of the world. We shall have race hatreds because it is to the interest of the ruling classes to foment race hatreds. To the engines of war, race hatreds are what steam in the boiler is to steam engines.

Will you not help us to end this intolerable condition? Ask your God what you should do? Ask Him whether, in this war matter, we Socialists are right or wrong?

Our souls are on their knees to you. Help us to take away from 135 men the power to plunge this country into war. Help us to write into the constitution of the United States: "War shall not be de-

clared except by direct vote of all the men and women in the United States.”

They say that dead men tell no tales, but it is not so. The oratory of no living man is so passionate as the oratory of the dead peasant killed in war. To every man, at some time, nature gives a tongue. The peasant, when he is alive, is thick of speech. His words halt. His sentences stumble. He is eloquent only as his sufferings indict his time. But when his heart is still and his face is upturned to the stars above the battlefield—then it is that he speaks as living man never spoke.

Every dead soldier in Europe is today speaking so loudly that the living can hardly be heard. Every dead soldier in Europe has a particular message for the people of the United States. That message is:

“Take war into your own hands.

“Don’t let one man, two men, three men or 500 men say whether a hundred million shall be plunged into war.”

CHAPTER XIII

THE PROSPECTS FOR MORE WAR

WELL-MEANING, but thoughtless, men speak of the present conflict in Europe as "the last war." Men who can see beneath the surface of things speak of it as "the first great war." Men of this sort see in the present conflict in Europe the first of a series of colossal struggles that will shake civilization to its foundations and perhaps place Europe under the domination of the yellow races.

Roland G. Usher, Professor of History, Washington University, St. Louis, published a book early in 1915 which he opened with the following declaration:

"The United States is facing a crisis without parallel in its history since the signature of the Declaration of Independence. . . . Whatever the result of this war" (the Great War in Europe) "may be, whoever wins it, whenever it ends, the victor will be able to threaten the United States, and, if he chooses, to challenge our supremacy in the Western Hemisphere. The motive for challenging it is already in existence; the power to do so effectively will, beyond doubt, be in the victor's hands." *

A Frenchman, Urban Gohier, writes most interestingly upon the prospect of a series of great wars following this one. He says:

* *"Pan-Americanism,"* p. 3, published by the Century Company, New York.

“Remember the two Balkan wars. The first one was terrible; the second was still more cruel. The allies who had crushed Turkey rent each other in the struggle to divide the booty. After the collapse of the German empire and the Austro-Hungarian empire, the booty will be richer, the participants therein more numerous, the difficulties more inextricable.

“Within each country, formidable disorders will arise. Several millions of men will return home to their hearths with new souls. Their sufferings and perils will have given them other desires, other ideas, other manners. They will not dread violence as yesterday they dreaded it, and they will not have the same respect for human life; they will have seen death from too near by, and will have marched over the corpses of friends and enemies.

“On the morrow of the peace, England will find herself face to face with Russia, and the Socialists face to face with the conservative parties, the anti-clericals face to face with the Catholics and political coteries face to face with their rivals. To sum up, I foresee a long battle between the Germanic *bloc* and the Allies, followed by arduous difficulties among the Allies themselves, before the territorial, economic and dynastic reorganization of Europe and its dependencies; thereafter, social disorders of great violence.”

In the United States, a publication called *The Navy* predicts a “world-wide convulsion that may set race against race and continent against continent”; declares its belief that this is “but the first of a series of tremendous world-wide conflicts that will be fought by the inhabitants of the earth for national supremacy

until that supremacy is obtained by some single people or possibly by an amalgamated race, the ingredients of which are now being thrown into the melting pot." *The Navy* closes with the final supplication:

"When Afro-Eurasia has passed under the domination of the final winner and its now undeveloped peoples have assimilated the war science of the modern world, then will come the test of the new world's strength. May we be prepared!"

It is only prudent, on our part, to give thought to these matters. They are serious. Each of the predictions is possible. The struggle in Europe is too gigantic for anyone to place limits upon its possibilities. It is shaking civilization to the ends of the earth. Its effects will be felt for centuries. But we who live in this country may (if we have the intelligence and the foresight) keep out of the maelstrom. If we shall not keep our civilization afloat, it will be because we lack the brains and the energy.

How can we keep it afloat? By heeding the appeal of *The Navy*, the official organ of the navy, and building a great, aggressive fighting establishment? Never could anyone indulge a greater folly than by thinking so. Germany had the greatest military establishment on land that ever existed—and Germany is in blood to her ears. Great Britain had the greatest naval establishment that ever swam the seas—and Great Britain is fighting for her life. Neither military preparedness or unpreparedness has ever saved a nation from

war. Spain was in miserable condition in 1898 to fight the United States—but she had to fight us.

How can we so put our house in order that it shall not catch fire? Let us begin in the cellar and see what tinder is lying about.

Eight thousand miles west off our western coast are the Philippine Islands. Upon these islands dwell an alien people. Our flag floats over them—against their will. As it flutters in the breezes of the Far East, it is to many other nations like a red rag to a bull. Japan does not want us there. Japan would like the islands for herself. They are important to her, for strategic purposes. They are rich in raw materials. They are needed as an outlet for her crowded population.

So long as we permit our flag to float over the Philippine Islands, so long will it be possible for any nation to strike us eight thousand miles away from home and compel us to go eight thousand miles from home to protect ourselves. So long as we hold the Philippines, there will be an incentive for the capitalist class of Japan to attack us at the favorable moment. So long as we hold the Philippines, we shall stand before the world as an unjust nation. We say to the world, through our Monroe Doctrine: "You shall not colonize in the western world—the two Americas." Yet we say to the world: "We will colonize where we please. You shall not come west, but we will go east."

By no principle of equity can this attitude be justi-

fied. We are wrong, and so long as we hold this position, we shall always be wrong. The world, since 1899, has borne with our wrong-doing, but the world will not always bear with it. If we hold the Philippines, sooner or later we shall have to fight for them. When we fight for them, we may not have to fight Japan alone—we may be pulled into a world war and have to fight with whatever allies Japan may chance to have.

Are the Philippines worth it? Are the Philippines worth anything to us? What are the Philippines worth to you? Has it been easier for you to make a living since McKinley took the Philippines? Are your wages higher? Is your rent lower? Are your grocery bills less?

The possession of the Philippines has helped no living person in America except the office holders who have been sent to them, the sugar and tobacco trusts and other groups of capitalists. They have already cost us hundreds of millions of dollars and thousands of lives. Mr. Taft says we must keep them at least 50 years longer before we can safely leave the Filipinos to govern themselves. If the retention of the Philippines 50 years longer should drag us into a world war, do you think their retention would be worth while? Granted that the Filipino is not capable of governing himself—are you to blame for the Filipino's shortcomings? Which is the more important to you—yourself or the Filipino? Are you willing to slaughter yourself to educate him? If you are not,

why not cut him loose and let him do the best he can? Why not speed away from him as the captain of a battleship would swerve aside to dodge a floating mine?

If the people of the United States desire to keep clear of the welter of blood that is coming they should draw back upon their own continent, stick their toenails into their own soil and say to the world: "Here we stand. We want no foot of alien soil. We will not go a foot away from our shores to fight anyone—but we will put six feet under ground anyone who comes here to fight us."

We should set free, not only the Philippine Islands, but Hawaii, Guam, the Samoan isle that we own in partnership with Germany, Porto Rico and every other insular possession. Each of these islands is a source of weakness to us, rather than of strength. We took them only because we became intoxicated with the fumes of world-power. We wanted coaling stations and supply depots for our warships. If we had intended to keep our ships at home, where they should be, we should not have wanted coaling stations all over the far seas. But we did not intend to keep our ships at home. We intended to send them far away. We intended to be marauders on the high seas. We intended to be trade-grabbers and land-grabbers. We intended to depend, not upon the justice of our cause, but upon the strength of our arms. We intended to forsake our traditions and become strugglers with the powerful for the spoils of the earth.

Let us turn back before it is too late. Let us go back to the good old days when we stood upon our own continent—and nowhere else—and feared nobody, though we were unarmed, because we were wronging nobody and everybody knew that our intentions were both honorable and peaceful.

If we have the wisdom and the energy, we can compel our Government to abandon the race for world-power, to set free the distant islands that are like bombs dangling at our breasts, and return to the ways of an honest nation. Settled back upon our own continent, we shall be out of the currents of strife. We shall be exceedingly unlikely to be dragged into war, and, in the event of war, we shall be enabled to fight along our own coasts, where we are strongest, instead of 8,000 miles away from home where we are weakest.

CHAPTER XIV

WAR AND SOCIALISM

A MAN who is not a Socialist wrote a letter to the editor of the *Springfield Republican* in which he said: "If Socialism will put an end to war let us have it, and quickly, too." The editor of the *Springfield Republican*, who is not a Socialist, wrote an editorial reply in which he said: "Socialism never looked more attractive than now." *

Good sometimes comes as the result of driving iron into the souls of men. This tremendous war in Europe is driving iron into the souls of men as no other event ever did. By the light of gunfire, we are seeing our civilization as it is. Gentlemen who, in the past, have endorsed this civilization may well be asked what they now think of it.

Let us look facts in the face. This is a civilization rooted upon the private ownership by a few of what everybody must use. It is a civilization of barter and trade, supply and demand, plunder and profit. It is a civilization in which the few always have the supply and the many always have the demand. It is a civilization that gives the greatest possible incentive to selfishness and the least possible incentive to brotherly

* The editorial is reproduced in the appendix.

love. It says to all of us: "There is but one law in this world and that is the Law of Get." It says to all of us: "Everything that material earth can offer shall be the prize of those who can get." Which makes it certain that everything that hell can inflict shall be the punishment of those who cannot get. From the cradle to the grave they must be clad in a mantle of fear. They must try to wrest a living from an earth they do not own. They must know the tortures of summer heat and the rigors of winter cold. Everything that poverty and ignorance can do to harry and torment human bodies and human souls is done to them. I often wonder why the disinherited, when they look up into the starry heavens and see some of the twenty million suns, each of which is surrounded by several planets—I often wonder why they do not ask: "Why did God send us here? Is there no place in the universe where men might live without being preyed upon in peace and butchered in war?"

We who are Socialists ask you who are defenders of the present system to survey what you have wrought. You say your civilization is based upon Christianity. We are compelled to ask you if you know what Christianity is. Does Christianity mean slums? Does Christianity mean ignorance? Does Christianity mean race hatred? Does Christianity mean Gatling guns for those who strike for more wages? Does Christianity mean Homestead, Ludlow and Louvain? Does Christianity mean Rockefeller,

the Rothschilds and Morgan? Does Christianity mean battleships, battalions and bombs dropped from the air? And, if Christianity means none of these things, why do you say this civilization is Christian? Why do you taint the name of Christ by mentioning it in the same breath with the existing industrial order?

You oppose Socialism. You say it would destroy the home. You say it would destroy initiative. You say it would introduce chaos into civilization. What is capitalism doing? Is capitalism breaking up any homes in Europe? Is capitalism destroying any initiative? Is it introducing any chaos? If the public prints may be believed, a war is at this moment in progress in Europe that may conceivably destroy civilization. It is desolating hundreds of thousands of homes. Twenty millions of men are fighting each other with every deadly weapon to which they can lay their hands. Fighting each other for what? Fighting each other because their economic masters have ordered them to do so. Fighting each other that the capitalist groups of some countries may hold their trade and their profits, or gain the trade and profits of some other countries. For no other reason under the heavens is this war being fought. In no conceivable circumstances can any gain come to the working class of any of the nations, irrespective of which group of nations may be victorious. Such gain as there may be will be only for the group of capitalists who happen to be upon the winning side.

Are these the acts of a Christian civilization? Do you believe Christ would set twenty millions of men fighting to determine which groups of capitalists should derive profits from the slaughter? Do you believe Christ would sanction slaughter for profit? Then why do you say your civilization is Christian, bottomed as it is upon the private ownership by a few of what all must use; bottomed as it is upon poverty, profit and plunder?

If this civilization is Christian, what would be devilish? If a devil were actually in existence and ruling this world as the capitalists are ruling it, would you approve his acts? If America had produced record-breaking crops, as it did in 1914, and the masses of the people were yet hard put to it to get bread for their mouths, would you still say, "We are indeed ruled by a wise and benevolent devil—I shall vote for his candidates at each opportunity"?

If the devil denied work to millions of Americans, though all about them were the materials with which they might make themselves comfortable, would you still say, "By no means must we forsake our grand and noble devil. Without him, God knows what we should do."

And if the devil, to increase his profits, were occasionally to set millions of his subjects to slaughtering each other, would you say, "Do not blame our dear devil. It is not his fault. His heart bleeds to see us murdering each other, but we are just naturally wicked and stupid enough to do so." Would such actions be

“Christian” even if performed by the devil? If not, how can they be Christian when performed by capitalists?

We Socialists lose no opportunity to paint capitalism black. You who support capitalism often accuse us of indulging in too much denunciation. Will you be kind enough to read what the great spokesmen of capitalism say of each other? Emperor William, in his cablegram to President Wilson, declared that “After the capture of the French fort of Longwy, my troops found in that place thousands of dum-dum bullets, which had been manufactured in special works by the French Government”; that “the way in which this war is being waged by my opponents is making it one of the most barbarous in history,” and that the Belgians, like the French, had been guilty of enormous atrocities.

At the precise moment when this message was coming under the ocean, a commission of Belgians were coming over the ocean to make even worse charges against Germany. And, within 36 hours, the President of France cabled to President Wilson that every word cabled by the Emperor of Germany was a lie, that Germany herself, “since the beginning of the war,” had used dum-dum bullets, and “violated daily the law of nations.”

Now, in the German Emperor we have not an irresponsible German soldier babbling about a rumor that some other soldier may have told him. Nor in the Belgian commission or the President of France

have we irresponsible men. Nor do these responsible men qualify their charges by saying that "it is reported" that dum-dum bullets were used or other atrocities committed. Each of these men makes the unqualified charge that his country's enemies are outrageously offending against the law of nations, while the German Emperor says the barbarity of his enemies is "making this one of the most barbarous wars in history."

From these statements there can be but three inferences. One inference is that capitalism in Europe is represented in one or more nations by barbarians. One is that it is represented by liars. The other is that it is represented by both barbarians and liars. We who are Socialists leave this to you who are not Socialists for your consideration.

The fact is that capitalism is barbaric and mendacious at all times—in peace no less than in war. If you want to see barbarism of the most atrocious kind, go to any great industrial center and observe the conditions that capitalism enforces upon the working class. Go to Gary, Indiana, and see the shacks covered with tar-paper in which the employés of the prosperous Steel Trust live. Go to the coal mining regions of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio or Illinois. Go to the mining towns of Michigan or Colorado. Go to the East Side of New York or the stockyards district of Chicago. Go even to the smallest industrial cities and villages and there you will find patient men and women industriously toiling for enough

to keep soul and body together. Belgium mourns for but one loved and lost Louvain, but in the heart of almost every working man and woman more than 40 years old is a blackened, desolated city—the ruins of the City of Hope. Barbaric capitalism, for no other reason than to obtain profits, strikes down this city in millions of breasts and leaves the workers to live from hand to mouth until death closes their eyes.

Nor is this all. When barbaric capitalism is threatened with the loss of any considerable part of its prey, barbaric capitalism becomes a liar. If a great strike becomes formidable, press agents are hired to flood the country with lies about the strikers. According to these lies, the labor conditions in the strike regions are always “the best in any similar territory in the country,” with wages the highest and general working conditions the most satisfactory; the strikers are always declared to have been perfectly satisfied with conditions until “agitators” invaded the region and by threats and violence actually drove the workers out. If trouble occurs, it is always because the strikers attacked the millionaires.

But why go on with these familiar facts? It is enough to say that capitalism, both in peace and in war, is a liar. Who would take a capitalist's mere word for any sum of money large enough to make it to his interest to break his word? Certainly not any capitalist. When these gentlemen—who know each other—do business with each other, everything of importance must be in writing and, if possible, with

some sort of forfeit attached. It is not that they are intrinsically bad men, but the system under which they live is bad. It is this system that makes the monarchs of Europe liars or barbarians or both.

Never within the lifetime of anyone now living can the world be what it might have been if the capitalist system had been destroyed before it plunged Europe into war. Europe will bind up its wounds, but for many a year it will be a pale, shaken Europe. The blood of a continent cannot be drained from its veins without producing a profound effect, both upon the continent and the world.

Let me put a little sharper point upon this.

At the time this criminal war was precipitated, the world was in the highest state of efficiency that it had ever been. By "efficiency" I mean that the various parts of the social organism were co-ordinating better than they had ever done before. The process of co-ordination was by no means complete—in fact it had barely begun—but the results obtained were none the less noteworthy.

To illustrate the difference between a world in which there is little co-ordination and a world in which there is an approach toward harmonious social functioning, let us turn to the field of invention. When James Watt, in the latter part of the eighteenth century, invented the steam engine, there was little or no social co-ordination. An atmosphere had not yet been created that much stimulated invention. The telegraph and the newspaper had not yet made easy the inter-

change of thought. Even neighboring nations were farther apart in thought than the east now is from the west. The news of what Watt had done traveled at snail pace. Wherever it penetrated, nobody was much concerned. The world was too dull to be much concerned about anything. And, as a result of this lack of co-ordination, something like a hundred years were required to develop the old-fashioned "reciprocating" type of steam engine. In fact, it is only within the last quarter-century that this type of engine reached what appears to be the limit of its capacity, the sign of which was that inventive genius turned to other and better types—the steam turbine, for instance.

How different the reception of the automobile. The first automobile was made early in the '90's. It was a new world into which it came. The inventors and mechanics of Europe and America seized the automobile and exerted themselves to the utmost to develop it. America, France, Italy, Germany and England worked with fine enthusiasm and with such splendid results that within 20 years from the first "horseless carriage," the automobile is practically developed.

Barely 10 years ago the Wrights began to glide in the air. Less than seven years ago they began to fly with mechanical power. Instantly, the power of co-ordination was felt. The inventors and mechanics of the earth tackled the aeroplane, with the result that in this criminal war, aeroplanes are more numerous than buzzards. The aeroplane is by no means developed,

but it has advanced more in seven years than Watt's engine advanced in seventy-five.

To the co-ordinative faculty of the world this colossal war is like a railway tie thrown into the wheels of a machine. War will not destroy the telegraph and the printing press, but it will vitiate the atmosphere in which invention thrives. Europe, when it gets off the operating table, will be too preoccupied with its wounds to pay much attention to what the rest of the world is doing. Since this is a fight for life between certain of the nations, the defeated ones, whichever they may be, are not likely to strike their old stride for many a year. Nothing is more certain than that this war has stifled ideas of value that, in favorable circumstances, would have been developed and given to the world. We, who are still at peace, may continue to generate such ideas as we can, but when we turn to Europe for help toward their development we shall not find the alert, effective Europe that so greatly contributed to the development of the automobile and the aeroplane. That Europe is being shot to pieces.

Yet impaired efficiency is only a part of what the world must lose because groups of competing capitalists set upon a course that plunged half the world into war. Who can go to the battlefields and pick out and bring back to life the dead Marconis, the dead Edisons and the dead Watts? Genius is so erratic in choosing its parentage that millions of men, even though they be poor, cannot be shot down without danger of snuffing out some star that would have de-

veloped into first magnitude. Edison, if he had been a year or two older, might have been killed in the Civil War without anyone suspecting that in the death of this poor Michigan boy the world had lost a genius of the first order.

If it were only in war that capitalism is murderous; if it were only in war that undiscovered genius is snuffed out before it can bloom, the case for capitalism would still be black, but it would not be so black. While "Peace hath her victories, no less renowned than war," it is also true under capitalism that peace hath her industrial murders, even more numerous than war.

Every year capitalism, by failure to provide safety appliances the cost of which would reduce dividends, slays the miners who dig our coal and iron.

Every year capitalism, by enforcing unjustifiable poverty upon the land, kills 150,000 Americans with tuberculosis,* though tuberculosis is purely a preventable disease.

Every year the scourge of typhoid (the disease that killed Wilbur Wright) goes on, though the means of preventing typhoid are well known.

Year after year, millions are compelled to live in squalor in the great cities, often unable to get work, never able to get any of the comforts nor more than the barest necessities of life; always the prey of the

* See the "Report on National Vitality" made to President Roosevelt by Professor Irving Fisher of the Department of Political Economy, Yale University.

diseases to which their declining vitality and their unwholesome surroundings make them subject.

Every year millions of the children of the poor are taken from the schools before they have obtained any groundwork of education that is adequate to make them able citizens of a great republic.

Every year the high schools graduate less than 5 per cent. of those who entered the elementary grades, the remaining 95 per cent. representing (ordinary mortality excepted) those whom poverty compelled to become breadwinners while they were still children.

All of these evils are upon us because capitalism is upon us.

After painful research we have learned how to stamp out tuberculosis, only to discover that we cannot apply our knowledge because of the fact that to do so would compel some capitalists to destroy their foul tenements, and other capitalists to pay enough wages to enable their employés to maintain their physical efficiency.

We have learned after painful research how to destroy the sources of typhoid infection, only to discover that our knowledge cannot be applied without the expenditure of more of the capitalists' money than they are willing to contribute in taxes.

We know how to build sanitary houses and we know how to make food that is not poisoned nor vitiated by the substitution of cheaper, though harmful ingredients, but our knowledge does us little of the good it might. Every city is largely composed of

houses that are palpably unfit for human habitation; the forests and the earth abound with materials with which good houses might be made; the streets swarm with idle men who would gladly earn a living for themselves by building the houses we need. But under the capitalist dispensation these men are not permitted to build houses nor to do anything else; and the same class of men who prevent the idle from doing the work that we need done also fight us tooth and nail if we try to compel them to make food that is fit to eat. Anyone who considers the last statement an exaggeration would do well to communicate with Dr. Wiley. The pure-food cause is making progress, but it is doing so only as it fights and defeats the persistent capitalists who, for no other reason than the desire to increase their profits, are eager to rob, starve and poison their fellow men.

What shall we say of a class against which such charges can be truly made? Is civilization based upon this class a Christian civilization? If it were not for the "right of private property," which carries with it the desire to profit from the labor of others, none of these charges could be made. The institution of private property is the very heart and soul (if there be a heart and soul) of capitalism. Yet it is this institution of private property that, in this country alone, annually kills hundreds of thousands and condemns millions of the working class to an existence that is void of hope and full of misery. The Reverend

Holden E. Sampson, of Corpus Christi Church, New York City, even went so far as to declare:

“The war in Europe, the most decimating of all wars in history most probably, is more merciful, less cruel, than peace, as times are. To many thousands it is far better, happier, to die on the battlefield than to live in our present ‘civilization.’ The death roll of ‘civilization’ is vastly greater than the death roll of all the battlefields the world has ever witnessed.”

All that this gentleman says about the death roll of civilization is true. All of it is important. What are you going to do about it? Do you want it to continue? Are you going to call it “Christian”? Do you doubt that it will continue so long as the underlying cause continues? Do you doubt that the underlying cause of inadequate wages is the private ownership of the industries that pay the inadequate wages?

What are you going to do about the school question? You believe in free schools. Why don't you also believe in free school children? Are you willing that nine-tenths of our children shall forever be driven out of school by poverty while they are still in the grammar grades? What kind of citizenship do you expect from ignorance? A republic can be no wiser than its people—what kind of a republic do you expect to rear upon education that is stopped in the grammar grades? How monstrous is a civilization that denies to millions of adults the right to work while compelling children to leave school to work!

We Socialists tell you that this might be a nation

of happiness, in so far as a sufficiency of needed material things can create happiness.

We tell you that the natural resources of this country, if developed solely for the country's good and without thought of private profit, are sufficient to care for a population of 500,000,000. (Note the population of little Belgium.)

We tell you there is no reason except capitalism why all the men in this country cannot be employed all of the time, as we tell you there is no reason except capitalism why any of the children should be hired out to wage-slavery any of the time.

We tell you there is no reason except capitalism why great military establishments should be maintained at the expense of the people or wars fought by the people at their own expense.

By voting against us, you challenge every statement that we make.

But in the white light of war will you kindly take paper and pencil and point out our errors.

We want beef. Is there any reason except capitalism why the United States Government could not raise cattle in sufficient numbers and market the beef at the cost of operations? The United States Government is carrying parcels, though a few years ago you said it couldn't. The United States Government, at an expenditure of \$400,000,000, is carrying steamships across the isthmus of Panama. Why cannot the United States Government raise and market beef, dig and market coal, grind wheat and market flour, dig

iron and market steel, weave and market cloth, own and operate railways?

Why cannot the United States Government build houses and rent them for a sum that represents only the annual depreciation? Little New Zealand is doing it. The United States can build floating fortresses that cost \$10,000,000 each—fortresses in which death is dealt out to human beings. Why cannot the United States Government as well build houses in which life and comfort are dealt out to human beings?

Why cannot the United States Government take this tremendous army of unemployed that is now going to waste and set it to work raising beef, weaving cloth, operating trains and producing those things of which we stand so much in need?

To say that the United States Government, if permitted to do so, could not do all of these things and more is to say that the United States Government is administered by fools. Such is not the fact. The United States Government is administered by men far above the average in intelligence. But the United States Government is also administered by men who are pledged to the support of the capitalist system. If these gentlemen did not so believe they would not have the Government in their charge.

It is no answer to the foregoing questions to say that Mr. Wilson and his associates are wise men and that, if it were well to perform the acts herein suggested, they would perform them. The administrators of every system have always supported the system.

The leading savages supported head-hunting. The leading barbarians supported barbarism. The nobles and the kings supported feudalism. But such civilization as we now have is due to the fact that, one after another, savagery, barbarism and feudalism were banished from our part of the world. Moreover, they were banished not by the leaders—they were banished by the people who refused longer to be led by such leaders. They were banished and the world was made better by lowly men who, to the marrow of their bones, felt that the things the wise men endorsed were evils of the vilest sort.

We Socialists make a practice of taking nothing for granted. We accept nothing merely because it is. We have some sort of knowledge of the route by which humanity has emerged from the jungle, and we know that the thing that is impossible can be done. The thing that is impossible has always been done. Only by the doing of things declared to be impossible has the human race advanced a foot. Edison himself told me that when he set out to make a dynamo that Ohm's law—a formula laid down by a great German electrician—made the creation of a dynamo for commercial purposes impossible; or, at least so he was informed by electricians who advised him to save his time. Edison had no respect whatever for Ohm's law. He determined to prove it no law. He did it. You tell us that the people of the United States, acting through their Government, cannot feed, clothe and house themselves. We frankly say we do not believe

you. By the power of our press and the men in our trenches we are going to drive you from your position. We are strong in the sense that we have right on our side and the needs of humanity upon our side. We will not be denied. By constant reiteration, by constant agitation, we will yet make the reasonableness of our demands so apparent that no well disposed man or woman will think of challenging us.

We are in this war to stay—every one of us—and we are going to say until the undertaker puts us away. In our fight against needless poverty and the capitalist power that makes needless poverty, we feel that we are engaged in as holy an undertaking as ever called men to action. We are resolved to be true to the end.

We hope the end will not be too long delayed. The human race has within it possibilities altogether too splendid to be wasted in the wars and woes of capitalism. We ask you to help us realize those possibilities. We ask you to come into counsel with us. We ask you to come with an open mind. We ask you to bristle with interrogation points as we ourselves bristle with interrogation points. We are eager to defend and explain. But, above all, we ask you to consider the God of Things as They Are as Edison considered Ohm's law. Don't come encrusted in the past. Be willing to look out and look up. Whether you help or not, the world is going to move on. With your help, it will move on more quickly, but without your help it will move on. The processes of evolution have

not stopped. The world is not finished. Indeed, it is hardly begun.

In a little while, at longest, you will be dead. The gentle rain at night will patter down upon your earthen roof and the morning sun will seek you out in vain. In a little while nothing that you have done will remain to show that you ever lived.

Before that time comes do something for humanity! Make posterity your debtor by helping to bring about a better civilization. Even at that, you may not be remembered. What of it? Is every drop in the ocean remembered by those who see the ocean? Yet every drop in the ocean, had it the power to speak our tongue might say: "I am the ocean, for, had I not the power to be, the ocean could not be."

APPENDIX

“THE PHILADELPHIA RESOLUTION”

(Resolution drafted by Allan L. Benson, adopted by the Philadelphia local organization of the Socialist Party and seconded by one hundred other local Socialist organizations.)

We demand that the constitution of the United States shall be amended as follows:

The power to declare war against a nation that has not attacked the United States of America shall rest solely in the people, to be exercised by them only on direct ballot. The power to resist attack shall remain and be in the hands of the President and the Congress, and shall be exercised without resort to special authority from the people. This nation shall not be regarded as having been attacked, however, within the meaning of this constitution, unless it shall have been invaded by an armed force or otherwise attacked in force in such manner as plainly to indicate the intent of the assailant to begin war. Unfriendly acts short of actual acts of war shall not be deemed sufficient to authorize the making of war by the United States without direct vote by the people. Nothing herein stated, however, shall be construed as any limitation upon the power of Congress and the President to prepare for emergencies by making such preparations as they may deem necessary for the defense of the nation.

Congress, by a majority vote of the membership of

each house, shall have the power to propose war. War having been thus proposed, an election shall be held in not less than sixty days from the date of the proposal, nor later than six months therefrom to determine whether war shall be declared. Congress shall fix the day of the election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. All male and female citizens more than eighteen years of age shall be deemed qualified to vote upon the proposal to declare war, and the ballot shall consist of a slip of paper upon which shall be printed the question :

“Shall the United States declare war against (naming the nation)

No

Yes.”

Each elector shall sign his or her name opposite the word indicating his or her choice.

In each precinct or polling place an accurate record shall be kept of the numerical order in which the electors exercised the right of franchise. In the event of a majority of the legally qualified electors of the United States voting to declare war, the President, as commander-in-chief of the army and navy, shall proceed to make war. But he shall not be authorized to call upon any elector who voted against war to perform military services until every male elector who voted for war shall have been mustered into service, sent to the front and the resultant army proved insufficient. In the event of a declaration of war, the men voting for such declaration shall be enrolled into the army in the order in which they cast their ballots. Men who vote against war shall be mustered into military service, if at all, in the reverse of the order in which they cast their ballots. Failure to vote shall be construed as a vote against war, but in the event of war, those who failed to vote shall be mustered in before anyone who voted against war shall be compelled to serve, compulsory service in this case being determined by lot.

Women who vote for war shall not be required to perform military duty unless the votes cast by men for war

would have been insufficient to bring war without the votes of women, in which event the women voting for war shall be sent to the front in the order in which they appeared at the ballot boxes. But in no event shall any woman who voted against war be compelled to perform military duty.

Every writer, public speaker and public official who shall advocate war shall, forthwith upon such advocacy, notify the President thereof, conviction of failure to do so being punishable by imprisonment for not less than five years nor more than ten. In the event of war following such advocacy within five years, such persons shall be required to go to the front as common soldiers and remain in the thick of the fight until the end of the war, unless sooner killed or incapacitated by wounds. If wounded, such persons, upon recovery, shall be sent back to the front if the war be still in progress.

The power to formulate and execute foreign policies shall be held and exercised only by the Congress. Each house of Congress shall elect such equal number of members as they may mutually agree upon to membership upon a joint committee of foreign relations. Congress, in joint session, shall elect the chairman of this committee, who may or may not be a member of Congress. The chairman of this committee shall rank as the head of the Department of State. In routine and minor matters he shall have such discretion as Congress may deem wise to give him, but in other matters he shall act only upon the initiative of Congress as expressed directly or through the joint committee on foreign relations.

Not later than the close of each business day, it shall be the duty of the chairman of this committee to furnish representatives of the press with complete and accurate copies of (1) all dispatches sent during the day to representatives of foreign nations (2) to all American ambassadors, ministers and consuls and (3) from representatives of foreign governments. It shall be unlawful to send verbal messages, or to direct messages to any other than the persons for whom they are actually intended.

Any evasion of these provisions, either by trick or device, or by failure to publish a message the same day it is sent shall be deemed sufficient justification for the impeachment and removal from office of the chairman of the committee on foreign relations and his indictment upon a charge of felony, upon conviction of which he shall be imprisoned in a federal prison for not less than one year nor more than five years.

“SOCIALISM NEVER LOOKED MORE ATTRACTIVE THAN NOW”

(From the *Springfield Republican*.)

A striking if despairing statement, this: “If Socialism will put an end to war, let us have it, and quickly, too; whatever it may be, and no one seems to know exactly, it can be no worse, and may be infinitely better than a system which can generate such a frightful spectacle as the world now sees before it in Europe.” The correspondent who closes his letter in that impressive style has undoubtedly given expression to an idea which has been the gist of the thinking of many minds in recent days. In the gloom of the hour, forward-looking people inevitably try to discern whatever of good may come out of the strife and tumult, and hope may even fasten upon anything that promises to put an end to war.

Socialism, whether regarded as a theory, or an organized movement, or a state of mind, never looked more attractive than now. Considered merely as an ideal, it has the inestimable temporary advantage of being able to prove beyond any possible controversy the cataclysmic capacity of the existing order for upsetting the civilized world. Could anything be worse? And the question may not confidently be answered at this point in the unfolding of a stupendous catastrophe. If Socialism in any form could be depended upon to insure mankind against such a prodigious backslide into savagery as one beholds at the center of western civilization, the case would be instantly closed and millions of minds would be made up that have hitherto seen in Socialism nothing but the perfectionist aspirations of visionaries.

But, in regard to war, Socialism is plainly on the right

track, whether or not it could ever be realized fully in the industrial organizations of society. At two points it strikes heavily at the foundations of the world's militarism. First, it embodies the principle of internationalism as opposed to nationalism, and the principle of human solidarity as opposed to race hatred. This war is a frightful jumble of national rivalries and jealousies, and of racial conflicts and animosities—so much so that by selecting in turn some particular factor for special emphasis one may plausibly justify the warlike course of each of the eight nations at this moment pursuing the business of organized murder.

The higher Socialism means, in the last analysis, the brotherhood of man; but it begins by wiping out nationalities and creating a political federation of the states that may be brought within the sphere of its influence. Socialism would create in Europe one great state having no aggressively imperialistic or militaristic basis, and thus it would obliterate those bitter nationalistic passions which have been responsible for so many wars periodically drenching the continent's soil with human blood.

"Slav against Teuton," "Latin against Anglo-Saxon," "Caucasian against Mongolian," "white against black," all the catchword coinage of the fierce race conflicts of the world, find in Socialism a consistent foe. This "Slav peril," which forms the staple excuse of the Austro-German alliance in precipitating the present war, shrivels to nothing under Socialism's analysis, for are not Slavs human and have they not built up a civilization and have they not produced great men and women who have enriched the world's culture?

Socialism strikes its second heavy blow at modern war by recognizing the complete equality of women with men in regulating the affairs of civilized society. What did women have to do with making this war? Absolutely nothing. Comparatively speaking, woman's influence has been negligible, because fighting Europe has been dominated by that fighting animal, the male of the species. The primitive passion for war is masculine; war has ever

been man's "game"; and men are the incontestable creators of the whole machinery and apparatus of scientific warfare. Women, according to war-lord philosophy, are made by the Almighty simply to bear sons in a fine plenty to be butchered on the battlefield. Women today throughout Europe are toiling in the harvests which were left unreaped when the storm burst and the sons and brothers and husbands were hurried away from their homes at the war-lord's summons.

If there are 20,000,000 soldiers from the Atlantic coast of France to the Ural Mountains, there are twice that number of women left desolate, perhaps impoverished, always in agony of spirit over the dreadful possibilities of the crash of arms. Surely, a world in which women exercised their legitimate influence upon affairs of state, as the natural conservators of the race, would make short work of war.

Militarism for the moment is dominant in the world, but it may be counted upon to bleed itself white in this titanic frenzy of conflicting nationalist, racial and autocratic ambitions. A momentous reaction will follow, and no one need be in doubt as to its character and trend.

JX
1953
B4

Benson, Allan Louis, 1871-

A way to prevent war, by Allan L. Benson. Girard, Kan., Appeal to reason, 1915.

3 p. l, ii, 180 p. 20cm.

1. Referendum. 2. War. 3. Socialism. I. Title.

15-11256

Library of Congress

JX1953.B4

334097

CCSC/ehw

